JAN 15 1935

GENERAL BOOKS
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

[illegible] Historical Review

January, 1935

[illegible]

[illegible] 237

[illegible] 252

[illegible] 266

[illegible] 274

[illegible] 295

[illegible] 301

[illegible] 308

BOARD OF EDITORS

VERNER W. CRANE — J. FRED RIPPY
TENNEY FRANK — CHARLES SEYMOUR
DUMAS MALONE — JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON

AND

HENRY E. BOURNE
Managing Editor

Editorial Assistant
ELEANOR D. SMITH

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Books of General History — PAGE

Commission on the Social Studies, Conclusions, by John S. Brubacher — 301
Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, XI–XIII, by Ralph H. Gabriel — 305
Toynbee, *A Study of History*, I–III, by Charles A. Beard — 307

Books of Ancient and Medieval History

Lavell, *A Biography of the Greek People*, by William Kelly Prentice — 309
Ciaceri, *Tiberio*, by Mason Hammond — 310
Paré, *et al.*, *La Renaissance du XII^e siècle*, by Gray C. Boyce — 311
Foster, ed., *Registrum Antiquissimum of Lincoln*, II, by N. Neilson — 313
Cameron, *Apostolic Camera and Scottish Benefices*, by W. E. Lunt — 314

Books of Modern History

Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, III, by Frederic Chapin Lane — 316
Franz, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg*, by Wallace K. Ferguson — 318
Hamilton, *American Treasure and the Price Revolution*, by Julius Klein — 320
Muller, ed., *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, by Conyers Read — 322
Japikse, ed., *Correspondentie van Willem den Derde*, I, by A. Hyma — 324
Merriman, *Rise of the Spanish Empire*, IV, by Preserved Smith — 325
Robertson, *Economic Individualism*; Brodrick, *Economic Morals*; *Law of Nations*, by F. I. Nussbaum — 328
Berney, *Friedrich der Grosse*, by Walter L. Dorn — 329
Mathiez, *Le Directoire*, by Leo Gershoy — 330
Greenfield, *Economics and Liberalism in the Risorgimento*, by Stringfellow Barr — 332
Hoffman, *Great Britain and the German Trade Rivalry*, by R. J. Sontag — 334
Guedalla, *The Queen and Mr. Gladstone*, by Herbert C. Bell — 335
Lovell, *Struggle for South Africa*; Van Der Poel, *Railway and Customs Policies in South Africa*, by Reginald G. Trotter — 336
Gooch and Temperley, eds., *British Documents*, Vol. IX, Pt. I, by Sidney B. Fay — 338
Anrich, *Die englische Politik in 1914*, by Bernadotte E. Schmitt — 340
Webster, *League of Nations*, by Dexter Perkins — 342

(List of Reviews of Books continued inside back cover page)

The American Historical Association supplies the REVIEW *to all its members; the Council of the Association elects members of the Board of Editors.*

Subscriptions should be sent to The Macmillan Company, 2450 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Va., or 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. The price of subscription is $5.00 a year; single numbers are sold for $1.50 (back numbers at the same rate); bound volumes may be obtained for $7.50.

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the REVIEW *may be sent to the Managing Editor, Henry E. Bourne, 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C. Books for review should be sent to the same address.*

COPYRIGHT, 1935, BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Volume XL] *January, 1935* [*Number 2*

The

American Historical Review

THE EMERGENCE OF THE FIRST SOCIAL ORDER IN THE UNITED STATES

I

THERE have been two conscious or unconscious social orders in the United States, where another great crisis is now forcing men to reëxamine the philosophies of their predecessors. The first of these began with the Stuart Restoration and ended in 1865; the second emerged slowly between 1823 and 1861, took definite economic form in 1865, and reached the acme of its power, if not its end, in 1929. There are many serious thinkers in the American intellectual realm to-day who feel that a third social order is slowly emerging, that democracy is going to be tried at last on a national scale. Hence it may not be out of order to describe and assess the first phase of the old plantation life which began when the Clarendon Code was applied to England, assumed a more dogmatic and arbitrary character soon after a clever New Englander showed the South Carolinians how to make a thousand bales of cotton grow where one had grown before, and came to its tragic end when Robert E. Lee surrendered at Appomattox.

If one would understand the making of the social and cultural life of the Old South, he must study the troubled Europe from which our model-setting ancestors came during the seventeenth century. There the wars for religious liberties were paralleled by the economic and social disasters due to the incoming shiploads of gold and silver from Central and South America. And while wars created artificial markets that suddenly collapsed, and the discovery of vast stores of the precious metals upset the value standards of the time, the rapid growth of English industry and drastic changes in agricultural life added to the social chaos from which hundreds of thousands of the more ambitious unemployed of Western Europe escaped to the stormy islands of the West Indies or the dangerous forests of North America. The common man of the

Stuart and Bourbon absolutisms was in a worse plight in 1607 and 1660 than his successor of our day; and it was the common man of the seventeenth century who set the patterns of life for which most Americans and most Western Europeans sadly contend to-day.[1]

II

During the first fifty years of British discoveries and settlements in North America, Bacon and Coke, Hooker and Sandys, Hampden and Milton, Lilburne and Baxter, Hobbes and Locke argued, wrote, quarreled, and fought over every principle of religion, self-government and personal freedom known to mankind. Although newspapers were already in existence, forty thousand pamphlets circulated among the English people during the first half of the seventeenth century. Rarely has there ever appeared in so short a period so many men of high intellectual ability and moral integrity—never quite so many ready to die for their ideals. Even the illiterate of the mid-seventeenth century must have known a good deal about the everlasting problem of equitable government.

From the turmoil of Stuart England there came hundreds of entrepreneurs who hoped to build on the protected peninsulas and islands of the North American mainland ducal and manorial estates like those which had been the models in European economic and social life for five hundred years. When all Europe took to smoking and chewing tobacco, when sugar came to be of common use about 1650, the opportunities of grand-scale agriculture were most appealing to the more ambitious emigrants. However, it was not easy to persuade unemployed folk—more numerous in proportion and more helpless then than now—to migrate to and become workers on the proposed manorial estates. Storms and strange diseases caused the death of one-fourth of all those who ventured to cross the Atlantic in hundred to two hundred ton ships; and more than a fourth of those who settled in Virginia and Maryland died within two years. Thus it was only the bravest and most self-respecting of the unemployed who yielded to the persuasions of entrepreneurs and ship captains to migrate to North America.

The terms on which the poorer freemen and the unemployed of England agreed to cross the dangerous Atlantic were vital elements in the make-up of the early North American character. Most men and women who went to the Chesapeake Bay country between 1620 and

[1] Sir Frederick Morton Eden, *The State of the Poor*, in three volumes published in 1797, gives ample information.

1660 stipulated that they would take the risks and become indentured servants for five or six years only on definite terms. And entrepreneurs who controlled vast areas of land, like the second Lord Baltimore or the lesser Claibornes and Willoughbys of Virginia, were glad to meet these demands. They paid six pounds each for transportation of servants to their new destinations and signed contracts in which they promised indentured workers, at the expiration of their terms, a tract of land, a new suit of clothes, a heifer, two pigs, firearms, and the simpler farm implements. These were basic conditions upon which the majority of white people became citizens of the North American colonies from Maine to Georgia. Nor can these people be regarded as poor ne'er-do-wells, as so many historians have seemed to think.[2]

With these guarantees in black and white, the would-be manor lords of Virginia and Maryland were sure to meet with difficulties. Indentured servants were crowded into little cabins on their masters' estates; but with vast stretches of Indian lands not far away, these workers were not disposed to become submissive serfs. If treatment was rough, pressure too great, and marriage among the servants punished too severely, they ran away to the frontier where they could hunt and fish for a living and buy lands from the Indians for bagatelles; and such great numbers of servants did run away that more laws were enacted on that than any other subject during a period of thirty years. But the laws could not be enforced effectively where half the population sympathized with the runaways; nor were the punishments of runaways so severe as the law prescribed when vestrymen of the churches and justices of the courts were often ex-servants.[3] Thus the plantation areas were unruly democracies.

Nor was this all. The Chesapeake Bay lands did not produce good tobacco more than five or six years in succession, save perhaps on limited river fronts. Consequently, permanent attachment of less ambitious workers to the soil was not possible. Plantations were always moving and changing. The masters of a few great estates lived in fair-sized houses on river banks during the second half of the seventeenth century; but a far greater number of planters were constantly migrating

[2] G. N. Clark, *The Later Stuarts, 1660–1714*, p. 25, shows that in a population of 5,500,520 there were 1,400,000 with incomes of £6 to nothing a year. From other evidence I am of the opinion that there was nearly a million unemployed after 1661, except in war time.

[3] William Waller Hening, *The Statutes at Large of all the Laws of Virginia*, vol. II, especially for the years 1660–1670.

westward or southward. Moreover, the downward trend of prices, except in the short period of uncontrolled British trade, 1642–1660, made the entrepreneur's and the manor lord's status quite uncertain. The guarantee of lands and freedoms to indentured servants defeated the formation of the stratified social order which was thought necessary. Although there was the appearance of religious discipline and control in Virginia, it was only an appearance.[4] People were not compelled to attend church. The bishop of London might name pastors to vacancies, but the salaries and terms of service depended on local vestries popularly elected. Everybody was required by church decrees to bury their dead in consecrated ground; yet many if not most landowners buried deceased members of their families in their gardens or on cherished hilltops. And, although the Prayer Book of James II's time was supposed to express every man's creed, quite a third of Virginia church members were dissenters or deists at heart. Thus prospective homesteads for all who wished them, the right to elect assemblies, and freedom of religious beliefs and conduct, that is, self-guided democracies, defeated all efforts before 1660 to set up a landed social order reflective of the reactionary ideals of the well-to-do. However, when the clever Edward Hyde and George Monck maneuvered Charles II back to his father's throne, one more grand effort was made.

III

There has rarely been a group of leaders who so seriously shifted the course of modern history as did the little clique who surrounded Charles II from the summer of 1660 to the autumn of 1667. Only three of them, Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon after the Restoration, Ashley Cooper, earl of Shaftesbury after 1673, and John Lord Berkeley, brother of the Virginia governor, were of high aristocratic stock. The others were self-made men who knew even better than Clarendon and Shaftesbury the art of personal aggrandizement: George Monck, earl of Albemarle, Henry Bennet, earl of Arlington, Sir George Carteret, one-time pirate and the "richest man in England", Sir George Downing of Harvard College, and two merchants, Martin Noell and Thomas Povey.[5] Nearly all of these were members of the privy council and thus

[4] Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *Patrician and Plebeian in Virginia*, gives a good account of social classes in Virginia during the 17th century.

[5] Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Salisbury, *History of His Own Time*, vol. I, bk. II, gives contemporary appraisals of these characters. *The Dictionary of National Biography* (British) gives corrective facts.

guided the policy of the crown; these controlling members of the council were also the masters of His Majesty's famous board of trade and plantations which worked out the new British colonial and commercial program; they likewise dominated both the East India Company and the new African slave trade corporation, in which the Duke of York and the king's "devoted" sister, the Duchess of Orleans, were heavy stockholders. Every important political and economic interest of Restoration England was thus under the control of eight intimates of His Majesty who were "interlocking" directors of one political and three commercial boards.[6]

Their purposes were clearly revealed in the Clarendon Code of 1662–1665, which decreed a complete surrender of all dissenters to the State Church, dismissed at a single stroke twelve hundred clergymen, cast such men as John Bunyan and Richard Baxter into prison, and sometimes executed groups of religious or political opponents who refused to surrender. If church folk held private meetings, they were expelled from the country and subject to execution if they returned. The next items of the control program were included in the Navigation Acts of 1660 and 1663: according to these, all British commerce was subjected to the strictest regulation. No ship could sail the seas unless two-thirds of its crew were British sailors. No sugar or tobacco from any of the plantations might be sold to other than English merchants, who demanded and enjoyed a monopoly of the home market; and His Majesty laid taxes on these colonial imports two to four times as high as the returns paid the original producers. French wines and silks might not go to any American colonists except through English hands; and no Dutch slave ship might enter plantation harbors. No one was allowed to take money out of England, except a few travelers; and no colonials might buy or sell commodities to French or Spanish neighbors who paid them in silver or gold. In 1662 the African slave company began its efforts to drive the Dutch slave traders off the west coast of Africa.[7] And to complete the process and avoid domestic interference, the House of Commons, composed of the king's friends, was to be adjourned from session to session and no elections were to be permitted except to fill vacancies, and these were to be carefully managed. To defeat Dutch interference, a pact was made with the emerg-

[6] Charles M. Andrews, *British Committees, Commissions, and Councils of Trade and Plantations, 1622–1675*, gives valuable information on this subject.

[7] George Louis Beer, *The Old Colonial System, 1660–1754*, vol. I, gives a full account of the laws of trade and navigation.

ing Louis XIV, kinsman of Charles II, and treaties were negotiated with Spain and Portugal which gave England control of the entrance to the Mediterranean, ownership of Bombay, and free access to Latin American ports. Would the elaborate program succeed and all the settlements of New England, the South, and the West Indies be brought into complete subordination?

IV

Sir William Berkeley, most eminent of all the plantation governors, was in London from the early summer of 1661 till the autumn of 1662, instructed and highly paid by his people to resist all commercial restraints upon the tobacco planters. He lived with his elder brother, Lord John, and could hardly escape the influence of another brother, Lord Charles, or ignore the confidential relations of three other kinsmen of the same name with the Duke of York and the aging Catholic Queen Mother, Henrietta Maria. Before he departed he received a gift of £2000 from the king and was made one of the eight lords proprietors of the vast territory between Virginia and Florida, the other leading proprietors being Lord John Berkeley, Albemarle, Carteret, Clarendon, and Shaftesbury. The domain was to be divided into 48,000-acre tracts, each presided over by a landgrave of ducal rank who was to subdivide his domain into manors of 12,000 acres each. Sir William, who already owned tracts of land in the region, was made temporary supervisor and authorized to appoint a governor of the dissenter settlement soon to be known as Albemarle. About a year after Sir William's return, Lord John Berkeley was made joint overlord of New Jersey, with Sir George Carteret as his partner. Two years before the South Carolina settlement was made, Thomas Lord Culpeper and two or three other favorites of the governing clique were granted the six-million-acre area between the Rappahannock and the Potomac rivers. In 1673 Culpeper was promised the governorship and made feudal lord of Virginia. As the joyous Berkeley returned to his post on the James River, Charles Calvert, eldest son of the second Lord Baltimore and governor of Maryland, was already trying to cure the persistent democracy of the Maryland palatinate. Thus the democratic settlements from the Hudson to the St. Johns rivers were to be feudalized and fitted into the marvelous structure which Clarendon and his fellows had organized.

But the Navigation Act policy had reduced the price of tobacco from twopence to a halfpenny the pound. This halfpenny tobacco

was matched by a similar decline in the price of sugar all over the West Indies, where twenty years of free trade had given all the mainland colonists high-priced markets for their minor products, including meats, lumber, and barrel staves. The Restoration, the repudiated debts of the Cromwell régime, and the drastic commercial controls produced a terrible depression in England and all the colonies which continued unbroken for twenty-eight years.[8]

To this depressed area and atmosphere Sir William endeavored to apply the London reforms: He decreed that there were to be no more elections of members of the house of burgesses, except to fill vacancies; he persuaded the churches to abandon membership elections of their vestries and make them self-perpetuating social religious organizations; any ship captain who brought a Quaker to Virginia was to be fined 5000 pounds of tobacco—a Baptist equally unwelcome; and he continued the policy of having members of the council preside over county courts, fill vacancies, and recommend appointments of sheriffs. He persuaded the burgesses in 1663 to lay heavy taxes for the building of thirty-two new brick houses in little Jamestown, and all leading Virginians were required to build or own a house in or near the capital for social and relief purposes. The rates of wages and the cost of materials were fixed on artificial levels. Every landowner was given an allowance or a reduction of taxes if he planted mulberry trees for the development of a silk industry which was to block French imports of silk into the British empire. In the autumn of 1663 the Virginians and the Marylanders agreed to plant only limited crops of tobacco, in the hope of raising prices, but the agreement was violated. There was, however, so much dissatisfaction with the governor and his new régime that he asked and received a guard of twenty uniformed soldiers to accompany him wherever he went.

In spite of all these efforts, there was no recovery in the tobacco colonies, and in 1666 the populations everywhere were suffering intensely. Four years later the governor thought to secure his power by pressing through the house of burgesses a law limiting the ballot, even for vacancy elections, to freeholders, a measure already adopted in Maryland. Sir William and his manorial council of Carters, Chicheleys, Lees, Ludwells, and Wormeleys maintained their autocratic position with great difficulty. In 1672 there was imminent danger of Virginia's

[8] Beer, vol. II, ch. VIII, gives an inadequate account of this depression; the author was unaware of the real causes.

deserting the Stuarts and taking the side of the Dutch in their war for free trade. And there was even greater resentment in 1674 when the people learned that Lord Culpeper was to become a Virginia Lord Baltimore. Would the tobacco settlements definitely become a stratified and submissive social order? [9]

During the same years, the great lords proprietors were trying to apply their landgrave system in Carolina; but every report from pioneers on the Albemarle Sound and the Cape Fear River warned that no success was possible except upon the principle of homesteads for all, the rights of self-government, and religious freedom. John Locke insisted that such concessions must be granted, and Clarendon, who denied all religious freedom in England, agreed that Quakers, Baptists, and New England Puritans might have all they asked if they would buy lands and pay quitrents in their new domain. The first governor of the Charles Town settlement was a stern Puritan; and later a loyal Quaker occupied the same high station. For thirty years after the beginnings in the Albemarle region and on the peninsula between the Ashley and the Cooper rivers, the religious and political groups living on the lands of Clarendon, Carteret, and the Berkeleys refused to recognize the claims of landgraves and manor chiefs. It was the same kind of struggle that continued in Virginia between 1630 and 1660. But in 1692 the right to vote in the Carolinas was limited to freeholders as it had been limited in the tobacco country about 1670. Indigo and rice were coming to be staples which sold at high prices in England, and the more fertile stretches of land were acquiring high fixed values. The lords of manors seemed to have a chance of success, and there was everywhere the promise of a profitable social subordination.[10]

However, the drastic rule in England caused the migration, after 1670, of men like Giles Bland and the younger Nathaniel Bacon to the James River country where they found increasing resistance to the Berkeley authority. In a year or two the opposition was ominous, and in the spring of 1676 a violent revolution broke. Four-fifths of the people lent support to Bacon and Bland when they forced the election of a new house of burgesses and repealed all the control laws of the preceding thirteen years. In Maryland and upper Carolina there was ardent support of the Virginia return to democracy. But by the merest accident the retreating Sir William made a prisoner of Bland, and some

[9] Hening, II, 518 and 534.

[10] Edward McCrady, *The History of South Carolina under the Proprietary Government*, gives all the facts necessary for the understanding of the social evolution there.

weeks later Bacon was suddenly taken ill and died. There were no other competent democratic leaders available, and before the end of November the authoritarian governor was again on his throne with an increased number of guards around him. He had ordered the immediate execution of Bland, Drummond, and a score of his other opponents. Before the winter passed, his executions, imprisonments, and confiscations of property surpassed in number, if not in brutality, the similar performances of Charles II in 1660–1668. There would be no vestige of democracy left if the governor remained in office. Anxious people were leaving their homes and trekking to upper Carolina or the Virginia wilderness.

In Maryland, the work of Charles Calvert, although less arbitrary, from 1661 to 1675 gave evidence of greater success. Although religious liberty was not denied, the granting of vast strategic tracts of land to kinsmen and political favorites had given the declining lords of manors increased authority, and the limitation of suffrage was changing the character of the assembly. The Stuart method was more acceptable there than elsewhere. However, Virginia moved now quickly in the same direction. When Sir William Berkeley died in London in the summer of 1677, Lady Berkeley inherited all his estates and became the wealthiest person in all the Southern colonies. She was mistress of the Greenspring estate; she owned great tracts of land in northern Virginia and the Albemarle settlements, and she was one of the eight proprietors of the Carolinas. Her brother, Alexander Culpeper, an onhanger of the court of Charles II, drew a large income from the sales of lands in America, and her cousin, Lord Thomas Culpeper, was soon to assume the overlordship of Virginia.

Meanwhile, Herbert Jeffries, with mandates from Charles II, was trying to restore harmony among the terrorized Virginians. He was ignored and denounced by Lady Berkeley; and the majority of the council, led by Philip Ludwell, treated the new governor so badly that he took up his residence with Thomas Swann, a southside opponent of the emerging north-central Virginia aristocracy. Lady Berkeley assumed a leadership of the Virginia gentry which was hardly less effective than the governorship itself. For a period of three years she exercised an influence with the council and the burgesses which surpassed that of Margaret Brent, governor of Maryland in 1646. Although in 1680 she married Philip Ludwell, a third wealthy husband and president of the council, she remained "Lady Berkeley". Her Ladyship was well

known at Whitehall, and in 1690 she and her third husband became governors of the emerging aristocracy in South Carolina.[11]

Such influences, added to those of the deceased Sir William Berkeley, hastened the social evolution so much desired in London. And in Virginia, Maryland, and lower Carolina, large land grants, limited suffrage, and county oligarchies at last produced the effects so long desired. There were Carrolls, Talbots, and Taneys in Maryland; Washingtons, Carters, Byrds, and Blands in Virginia; Barnwells, Middletons, and Rhetts in Carolina. These families survived, like British families, more than a hundred and fifty years. However, these manor lords and plantation chiefs were not aristocrats of the Duke of Newcastle type. Although many of them were distant relatives of British noblemen, there were hundreds of less known gentlefolk whose success limited the pretentions of the first families. There were many eminent members of legislatures and leaders of county courts whose fathers (or even themselves) had been indentured servants. The old manor ideal was greatly modified, and men like the Wormeleys, the Masons, and the Rhetts worked with their hands and associated freely, if not on terms of equality, with small farmers and struggling frontiersmen. No man gives a better example of this than George Washington himself. There was then in all the old Southern communities the beginning of a social order which had taken definite form before Negro slavery became important.

V

Once again outside influences operated to modify American institutions. The British government forbade—about 1665—the selling of English unemployed as indentured servants. The poor were needed for war purposes. The Scotch, Irish, and certain criminals might be sold; but there were not enough of these, especially for the development of New York and the Carolinas, and the colonial assemblies protested against the admission of criminals. About the same time, the masters of the African slave company, directors of the board of trade and plantations and molders of the king's policy, made Jamaica the greatest slave mart in the world, and they constantly urged New Englanders, Virginians, and Carolinians to buy Negroes at fifteen to twenty pounds each, instead of white servants at eight or ten pounds

[11] *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* gives numerous sketches and articles on these subjects, but there is no account in print of the curious socialization represented by Lady Berkeley, and Lords Culpeper and Howard of Effingham.

each for shorter terms of service. It was not a bad appeal, and the fact that high officials of the government were financially interested did not lessen the pressure, although the Albemarles, Berkeleys, and Carterets were none too popular in the colonies. The early colonial instinct for democracy weakened the slavery appeal and delayed the movement. The migration of indentured servants was on the decline, yet there were in 1680 about 10,000 in the tobacco settlements, perhaps 4000 blacks, many of whom had been freed at the end of long terms of service.[12]

Except in the indigo and rice area of Carolina, toward the close of the century Negro slave labor was not considered profitable. However, the price of tobacco seemed fixed at a halfpenny the pound, except for the very best grades, and the greater planters were experimenting with slaves. Lady Berkeley, Ralph Wormeley, and a few others had already tried Negro workers on fairly large scale operations and found them profitable. A Negro, after a year's training, did as much as a white servant, and his food and clothes cost hardly half as much as those of an indentured man or woman. The Negro could not run away to the frontier, because the Indians would kill him; he did not expect a heifer, a new suit of clothes, and two pigs if he were set free; and in case a black man were freed, he hardly knew what to do—he certainly could not claim a hundred acres of land. Hence a freed Negro was not a free man. Everywhere vestries and county courts had been pondering these questions and rendering decisions: If a Negro became a Christian, he must still remain a slave; if a Negro woman bore children, they were in some cases the property of her master, in other cases they were considered free at twenty-one; if a free Negro wished to vote, the privilege was sometimes granted. Thus definite laws were due just about the time manhood suffrage in Maryland and Virginia was changed to freehold suffrage.[13]

Between 1664 and 1682 the tobacco planters, so sorely troubled about prices and unpayable debts in England that they actually pulled up their crops over wide areas, enacted the first slave codes of Southern history, the South Carolinians having adopted the practices of Barbados. The Negro servant now became a slave for life; Negro children were the property of the owners of their mothers; a slave was forbidden to own

[12] Elizabeth Donnan, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America*, vol. I, gives best documentary account of the origin of slavery in the Old South that is likely to appear.

[13] Helen T. Catterall, *Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro*, gives all available court records on these subjects.

or bear arms of any kind; there could be no assemblies or public speaking of Negroes at any time; no black person might leave his master's plantation without a visa; if a slave struck a white person he was to receive forty lashes, no matter who was to blame; and if a master killed a slave it was not a crime, it not being assumed that masters would kill their slaves except in self-defense. If a master freed a slave after 1682, he must supply the means of transporting him to Africa, where no Negro wished to go. Slavery was, therefore, slowly emerging before the Revolution of 1688 came, and it eased a little the economic depression in all the tobacco region.

During the four decades of almost continuous European war, 1672–1713, the tobacco and rice planters turned more and more to the slave system. The increasing number of privateers and pirates who slipped into mainland harbors, sold slaves and took tobacco or rice at high prices, increased speculation everywhere. Nor was England able to guard mainland and West Indian coasts against unlawful Dutch, French, and New England traders. Nearly all the troubled Europeans who could escape poured into Pennsylvania as poor freemen or indentured servants, Negroes being taken to the plantation areas. From little Baltimore to the emerging Beaufort of lower Carolina the slave process went on, and at last prosperity seemed to be restored, prosperity based on freer trade and increasing numbers of blacks.

Nor was there neglect of culture ideals. William and Mary helped the Virginians establish the first college in the Old South. A similar school was founded in Charles Town. Some young men went to Oxford and Cambridge and afterwards studied law under famous English masters. Young women lingered in London in the hope of being seen at court and learning how to dress and behave like true gentlefolk. All the Southern assemblies permitted lawyers to function in local and general courts and make money in devious ways— a practice which had been frowned upon and forbidden in the earlier days.

During these years the planters fixed themselves, built handsome brick houses on river promontories, surrounded them with dozens of one-room cabins for Negroes and beautiful gardens and lawns for their family recreations. White servants who did not move to the free frontier lands became share-tenants or slowly degenerated into "poor whites" whose descendants became more helpless and more numerous as the emerging aristocracy expanded westward and southward. The "great house" of a Lee in Virginia or a Middleton in Carolina was

during the eighteenth century not unlike the castle of a Seymour or Craven in southern or western England. There were porters, carriage drivers, gardeners, valets, cooks, and maids who occupied privileged positions as compared with their fellow slaves; there were scores of men and women who worked from sun to sun in the fields and the forests under Negro foremen and white overseers; and there were white folk who came on occasion to the "great house" with hat in hand to get contracts covering their operations, or to take directions about the management of their poor sandy farms.[14]

There was a schoolhouse near the "great house" where a poor Oxford or Cambridge graduate or the local preacher taught the planter's children, as well as those of his poor neighbors, the three R's, and sometimes Latin literature; there was a great dining-room where kinspeople or friends often came three-score miles to birthday or marriage feasts and dances; as the eighteenth century advanced there were stables for riding and driving horses; and there was in many, if not most cases a river harbor or landing place where hundreds of hogsheads of tobacco were exported annually and where people took ship for long sojourns in England. The master of the modified manor was generally a vestryman of the Established Church, although he was apt to be a deist; he was also a justice of the county court, and he had a little office in the corner of his great yard or grove where he had law books and often tried cases of minor significance; and he was apt to be a member of the legislature of his colony, sometimes a member of the sacrosanct colonial council with a commission signed by His Royal Majesty himself. He was not the landgrave or the baron that so many of the entrepreneurs of 1630 and 1663 had expected to become: he was the self-made planter without a title, rather crude in manner and dress, but enterprising and speculative in character. The service he rendered as vestryman or justice of the county court was never compensated—it would have been a dishonor widely criticized for him to take or ask payment from the county treasury; he regarded himself as a public servant. But he rarely paid the quitrents due to the British government; he frequently procured great tracts of land on the border of his province through the listing of names that did not exist and even the addition of ciphers to the figures in his grant. And he often gave freed white servants small

[14] Fairfax Harrison published in 1923 *A Frenchman in Virginia: being the Memoirs of a Huguenot Refugee in Virginia, 1686,* which gives many interesting touches upon the social and class distinctions of the plantation system.

tracts of land in order to make them freeholders and to command their allegiance in electoral contests, a custom which continued for a hundred and fifty years. But it was not easy to rear successful heirs, although the English custom of giving the major part of one's estate to the eldest son still prevailed. Since one's land was exhausted in eight or ten years and his slaves doubled in number every twenty years, poverty would be the lot of one's eldest son and slaves would be a liability.[15]

But the structure was fairly complete everywhere before William and Mary mounted the throne of the Stuarts; and the vast expanse of free lands and the numberless Negroes one might import from Africa gave some promise of increasing wealth and social eminence. However, the relaxing trade policy of the new monarchs and the twenty-five years of terrible wars in Europe hastened the growth of the new American feudalism and gave it a definite and fixed character before 1720.

William of Orange had represented the principle of free trade so long before his famous *Putsch* of 1688, that he could hardly be expected to enforce his dethroned father-in-law's stern decrees against his own Dutch subjects who always paid a Virginia or a Carolina planter twice as much for tobacco or sugar as a British monopolist would pay. There was, then, a less rigid commercial control in London, although Stuart laws were not repealed, which gave the planters their second era of prosperity. Planter estates with scores of slaves and half-scores of children adorned the banks of rivers and navigable inlets all the way from the upper Chesapeake Bay to the Savannah River. The Virginia landlords looked hopefully over the Blue Ridge mountains in 1716, and the slaveholding Huguenots of Carolina found their ways far up the enriching Cooper and Santee valleys about the same time. There was hardly a question anywhere now of the right of a white man to own a black man; and the profits of the system were such that new and more severe slave codes were enacted in all the colonies between 1705 and 1719. Negroes were so tightly clamped in their servile status that occasional revolts frightened the master class and naturally tightened the curious relations of poor whites to their wealthier neighbors. But there was no thought of emancipation, although up-country freemen and small farmers warned against the increasing importation of slaves.

[15] Avery O. Craven, *Soil Exhaustion in Virginia and Maryland*, gives an excellent account of this problem in an early tobacco region.

Nor was the unceasing war of Louis XIV without great influence. It gave freer rein to the privateers and pirates who infested the central and western Atlantic as never before. These ruthless robbers and traders, with retreats on the north shore of Cuba, carried trinkets and liquors to the west coast of Africa and brought slaves to Charleston and the Chesapeake Bay in sharp competition with the regular British commercialists. Nor were the energetic New Englanders unwilling to participate in this marvelous upbuilding of the Old South.

The Louis XIV wars had another decisive influence upon American institutions. Thousands of distressed Germans began to migrate as poor freemen or indentured servants to William Penn's Quaker democracy. And the increasing number of slaves in the plantation area diverted Scotch and Irish poor folk in the same direction. For fifty years the process continued, and the result was a new democratic experiment in Pennsylvania, and the more definite fixing of the slave system upon the South, the complete social control of the wealthier class, and the gradual emergence of a unique leadership in American history. This planter element of the Old South which hardly amounted to more than twenty-five thousand souls in 1720, gave rise to more distinguished and long-lived families than any other five million people known to American history. And any student of public life is amazed at the number of statesmen which this privileged class gave the world in 1776 —leaders who, like Washington, Mason, and Jefferson, were always ready to free their scores or hundreds of slaves and become relatively poor farmers for the good of their fellows.

The first American social order was thus a curious product of the arbitrary policy of the Earl of Clarendon, the democratic instincts of poor freemen and indentured servants, and a long and bitter struggle of five million Englishmen and their Continental allies against twenty million Frenchmen trying to dominate the continent of Europe.

William E. Dodd.

The University of Chicago.

THE INFLUENCE OF IRISH MONKS ON MEROVINGIAN DIOCESAN ORGANIZATION

About 591 Columban and his Irish monks came to Burgundy and built there the monasteries of Luxeuil, Anegray, and Fontaines. He was followed, for a century and a half, by scores of other *peregrini*. Their foreheads shaven back to the middle of the skull, with long, stringing locks and painted eyelids, they streamed through Gaul. Some settled there in monasteries of their own foundation. Others wandered eastward to Bavaria, Hesse, and Thuringia, where Boniface later found them. There can be little doubt that these Irish monks left their mark on the Christianity of the period. But it remains to be seen how far they actually influenced Merovingian monastic institutions.[1] One serious charge has been brought against them. They are accused of introducing into Gaul the monastery bishop and the privilege which permitted monks to apply for spiritual functions to bishops other than their diocesan. By so doing, they are credited with effecting the dissolution of the Merovingian system of diocesan organization.

The reasoning is as follows. Irish monasticism centered about the abbot. Bishops were simple sacerdotal functionaries with no administrative powers. They lived in monasteries under the rule of the abbot, unless the abbot combined the function of bishop with his abbatial office. Columban transplanted this system to Gaul. As a result of his influence and that of his followers, certain monasteries were freed from spiritual dependence on their diocesan. These might apply for ordinations and consecrations to any bishop they chose, whether to an Irish wandering

[1] For example, since Varin's monograph ("Mémoire sur les causes de la dissidence entre l'Église bretonne et l'Église romaine", *Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, 1st ser., vol. V, pt. 2 [1858], pp. 200 ff.), scholars have attributed the double monastery as found in Gaul, Spain, and Italy, to Irish provenance. However, in 1899 Mary Bateson first cast doubt on the argument in her "Origin and Early History of Double Monasteries", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, N. S., XIII (1899), 137–198. And in the last five years the case for Irish influence would seem to have been definitely disproved. John Ryan (*Irish Monasticism: Origins and Early Development* [London, 1931], pp. 141–145) and P. Stephanus Hilpisch ("Die Doppelklöster, Entstehung und Organisation", *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens*, XV [1928], 25–52), working independently, have shown that the double monastery was not an Irish institution to begin with. The instance at Kildare was, apparently, the only one. Consequently, there would seem to be no reason to connect the Irish monks with the foundations on the Continent.

bishop,[2] like Aid, who seems to have consecrated the altar of Luxeuil,[3] or to their own monastic bishop, or to the bishop of a neighboring diocese. This seems to be the conclusion of most scholars.

Much of the argument seems tenable. Certainly, by the third decade of the sixth century, the Church was more monastic in character in Ireland than in Gaul.[4] It may be going too far to say "every monastic establishment had among its officials a bishop, just as it had a porter or any other officer".[5] There were cases where all ecclesiastical orders were to be found in one monastery. But there were also many instances where bishops exercised their jurisdiction independently of monasteries, just as there were monasteries where the abbot combined the office of bishop with his other functions.[6] However, the custom of monastic bishop did exist in Ireland. And if it was not so widespread as has generally been assumed, it was of sufficient prominence that the argument is not vitiated. Consequently, when one finds a similar institution on the Continent, it seems not unreasonable to conclude that it was the result of Irish influence. Certainly, channels to spread such ideas were not lacking. Numerous monasteries were founded on the Continent by Irish *peregrini*. Space will not permit their listing here, but they make an impressive showing. Levison put the number at fifty. Warren, Graham, and Miss Stokes increased this estimate, Miss Stokes to one hundred and

[2] Bruno Krusch considered the wandering Irish bishops who followed Columban to be at the root of the privileges freeing monks from spiritual dependence on their diocesan: "Das ambulierende irische Episcopat ist wenigstens in der älteren Zeit die Unterlage und geradezu die Voraussetzung der Klosterprivilegierung." "Zur Eptadius- und Eparchius-Legende", *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XXV (1900), 135.

[3] Columban's letter, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Epistolae*, III, 167. It has been suggested that Aid was actually Aregius of Lyons (Albert Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* [Leipzig, 1912], I, 266, n. 6), but the weight of opinion would make Aid an Irishman.

[4] In Ryan's opinion, the Irish Church as founded by St. Patrick was not essentially monastic. But by the sixth century changes had occurred which placed emphasis on monastic organization. *Op. cit.*, pp. 82–96, 167 ff. See also Hans von Schubert, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche im Frühmittelalter* (Tübingen, 1921), pp. 206–208, 608–609; Hauck, I, 261 ff.; Louis Gougaud, *Les Chrétientés celtiques* (Paris, 1911), pp. 215–219; Ian C. Hannah, *Christian Monasticism* (New York, 1925), pp. 101 ff.; J. H. A. Ebrard, *Die iroschotische Missionskirche des sechstens, siebenten, und achten Jahrhunderts* (Gütersloh, 1873), pp. 159–234. A full bibliography on the organization of the Celtic Church is to be found in Gougaud's introduction.

[5] Herbert B. Workman, *The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal* (London, 1913), p. 194, quoting Willis-Bund.

[6] Ryan, pp. 168–179, 276 and n. 4.

five.[7] Luxeuil sent many abbots to Frankish monasteries, and many bishops to Frankish sees.[8] The means were surely at hand by which the Irish attitude toward the episcopate might have been spread in Gaul. It now remains to see if actual connections between the Irish customs and similar manifestations on the Continent can be shown.

Among the twenty-odd episcopal privileges which have come down to us from Merovingian times, there are seven which granted to the monks the right to apply to any bishop they chose for the ordination of monks, the consecration of altars and churches, and the consecration of chrism. These charters are those for Rebais (636), Sainte Colombe (659–660), Corbie (662), Notre Dame of Soissons (666), Saint-Dié (667), Murbach (728), and Arnulfsau (748). For purposes of this discussion, two other charters should be added, Eligius's foundation charter of 632 for Solignac, and Widerad's testament of 721 for Flavigny.[9] The other charters of the period reserved spiritual functions to the diocesan bishop, and so kept the favored monasteries under the spiritual jurisdiction of their diocesan. Actual connection with Luxeuil can be shown for Rebais, Corbie, Solignac, and Notre Dame of Soissons.[10] Murbach seems to

[7] W. Levison, "Die Iren und die fränkische Kirche", *Historische Zeitschrift*, CIX (1912), 6–7; F. E. Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* (Oxford, 1881), pp. 16 ff.; H. Graham, *The Early Monastic Schools* (Dublin, 1923), pp. 46–48; Margaret Stokes, *Three Months in the Forests of France in search of Vestiges of Irish Saints* (London, 1895), pp. 74 ff.

[8] Hauck, I, 293–295; J. M. Besse, *Les moines de l'ancienne France* (Paris, 1906), p. 460; Stokes, p. 74. Since Columban's *Rule* gave no hint of what he considered should be the relationship between monks and their diocesan bishop, I have not discussed the spread of his *Rule* in Gaul. This subject is treated by Besse, pp. 271 ff.; Hauck, I, 297, n. 1; A. Malnory, *Quid Luxovienses monachi . . . ad regulam monasteriorum atque ad communem ecclesiae profectum contulerint* (Paris, 1894), pp. 20–30.

[9] Jean Marie Pardessus, ed., *Diplomata, chartae, epistolae, leges . . . ad Res Gallo-Francicas spectantia* (Paris, 1843), nos. 254, 275, 333, 345, 355, 360, 514, 543, 596. *M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, IV, 746 ff.

[10] Rebais was founded by Audoen, later Bishop of Rouen, and a disciple of Columban. Hieronymus Frank, "Die Klosterbischöfe des Frankenreiches", *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens*, XVII (1932), p. 10; Joseph P. Fuhrmann, *Irish Medieval Monasteries on the Continent* (Catholic University of America, 1927), pp. 8, n. 30, 10, n. 33. Frank (p. 9) considers Luxeuil's lost privilege the model for Rebais. Yet it is difficult to see how this could have been the case if Marculf actually used the charter of Luxeuil as one of the models for his formula for an episcopal privilege, as he indicated (*M. G. H., LL.*, sec. V, vol. I, pp. 39–40), for the Marculf formula specifically reserved spiritual jurisdiction of the monastery to the diocesan, while that of Rebais freed the monks from it. For Corbie, see Fuhrmann, p. 10, n. 33; Henri Lévy-Bruhl, *Étude sur les élections abbatiales en France* (Paris, 1913), I, 82, n. 2. In Eligius's charter for Solignac the right of correction was given

have numbered many Irish among its monks.[11] If one accepts the authenticity of these nine charters,[12] the line of argument is clear: Rebais was founded by a disciple of Columban. Its monks received an episcopal charter freeing them from the spiritual jurisdiction of their diocesan bishop. Of the eight other monasteries receiving similar charters, half were definitely influenced by Irish monasticism. The case would seem well substantiated.

However, the case for Irish influence rests almost entirely on the authenticity of this group of charters. And that has been seriously questioned. The charters for Solignac, Rebais, Sainte Colombe, and Saint-Dié have been labeled outright forgeries.[13] And Levillain has

to the abbot of Luxeuil, and the customs of Luxeuil were prescribed. Drauscius's privilege for Notre Dame of Soissons said that the nuns lived according to the rule of Luxeuil. Pardessus, II, 139; J. Mabillon, ed., *Acta sanctorum*, I, xxxi.

[11] Fuhrmann, p. 33. Whether or not Pirmin, the founder of Murbach, was Irish, is a moot question. Fuhrmann concludes that he was, *faute de mieux*. He follows not unworthy precedent, p. 43, nn. 11, 12. But there has been considerable disagreement over the place of birth. England (Hauck, I, 347); Neustria (W. Wiegand, "Pirminius", *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, XXVI, 179); and now Spain, (Gall Jecker, "Die Heimat des hl. Pirmin", *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens*, XIII [1927]), have been assigned to him. In any event, the question is so disputable that it can hardly be used as evidence of Irish influence in the founding of Murbach.

[12] Gougaud (p. 221) also included the charter which Saint Omer granted to Saint Bertin in 662. But there is nothing in that privilege but a grant of immunity from depredations by episcopal agents and Saint Omer's successors.

[13] For Solignac, see Malnory, p. 86. Krusch upheld the authenticity of this charter in his introduction to the life of Eligius, *M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, IV, 743. Léon Levillain ("Les plus anciennes chartes de Corbie, réponse à M. Bruno Krusch", *Moyen Age*, 1904, pp. 140–146), and MM. V. Leblond and M. Lecomte (*Les privilèges de Rebais-en-Brie* [Melun, 1910]) consider Burgundofaro's charter of Rebais a forgery. Krusch ("Die neueste Kritik des ältesten corbieer Klosterurkunden", *Neues Archiv*, XXIX [1903], pp. 249–254); Levison ("Nachrichten", *ibid.*, XXXVII [1912], 869–870); and Frank (p. 10), do not agree. Paul Deschamps is of the opinion that the clause permitting the monks of Sainte Colombe to apply to any bishop they wished for spiritual functions was an interpolation of the ninth century. "Critique du privilège épiscopal accordé par Emmon de Sens à l'abbaye de Sainte-Colombe", *Moyen Age*, 1912, pp. 144–159. Krusch ("Die Urkunden von Corbie und Levillains letztes Wort", *Neues Archiv*, XXXI [1906], pp. 359 ff.); Levison ("Nachrichten", *ibid.*, XXXVIII [1913], 378); and Frank (p. 11) do not agree with Deschamps. However, Levillain ("Etudes sur les lettres de Loup de Ferrières", *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes*, LXII [1901], 490, n. 3), Leblond and Lecomte (p. 14), and Émile Lesne (*Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France* [Paris, 1910], I, 139, n. 1) concur with Deschamps. The following critics have considered the charter of Saint-Dié authentic: Pardessus, "Prolegomena", *op. cit.*, I, 298 ff.; J. Friedrich, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Bamberg, 1869), II, 198 ff.; Ch. Pfister, "Les légendes de Saint Dié et de Saint Hidulphe", *Annales de l'Est*, III (1889), 379 ff.; P. Wentzcke, *Regesten der Bischöfe von Strassburg* (Innsbruck, 1908), vol. I, pt. 2,

scaled the charter for Corbie to grants of episcopal immunity and freedom of abbatial election.[14] If one accepts these evaluations, the number of authentic charters freeing monks from spiritual dependence on their diocesan is then reduced to four, only two of which can be traced to Irish influence.[15] And the two charters where Irish precedent may be assumed can be matched by two other charters for monasteries of Irish foundation wherein the spiritual jurisdiction of the diocesan was preserved.[16] The case for Irish influence would seem to have dwindled considerably.

But let us assume the authenticity of these nine charters, five of which can be connected with Columban, Luxeuil, or the Irish generally. If Irish influence were as strong in Gaul as Krusch would have us believe, why, out of fifty-odd monasteries of Irish foundation, have we charters for only five? Granting that documents may well have been destroyed, surely some tradition of freedom should have persisted in Jouarre, Remiremont, Soignies, and the rest. Yet apparently the great majority of Irish foundations were able to exist under the spiritual domination of their diocesans. The argument from silence is admittedly dangerous. But the picture of Irish monasteries in Gaul is incomplete unless attention is called to the fact that so far as records show they were not freed from the spiritual jurisdiction of their bishops.

And again, if Columban's influence led inevitably to freedom from episcopal jurisdiction, why should a man like Audoen, founder of Rebais and disciple of Columban, refuse to recognize the spiritual independence of Irish monasteries in his own diocese? Yet this is evident in his treatment of Jumièges. Filibert, the first abbot and founder of the monastery, had been a monk of Rebais. Audoen removed him and, in the face of lively resistance from the monks, appointed two abbots in quick succession.[17] It may well have been that Filibert's removal was

p. 219, no. 26; W. Levison, in his preface, *M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, VI, 221, n. 5; Frank, pp. 13–14. However, its authenticity has been questioned by Pflugk-Harttung, *Diplomatisch-historische Forschungen* (Gotha, 1879), p. 29, n. 1; Levillain, "Les chartes de Corbie", p. 144, n. 2; Friedrich Wilhelm Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Göttingen, 1846), I, 524.

[14] *Examen critique des chartes mérovingiennes et carolingiennes de l'abbaye de Corbie* (Paris, 1902), especially pp. 183–184.

[15] Notre Dame and Murbach. In the latter case, Irish influence may be inferred only circumstantially. There is no reason to assume the presence of Irish customs in Arnulfsau or Flavigny, both of which were placed under the Benedictine *Rule* and were headed by Frankish abbots.

[16] Montier-en-Der (692), Pardessus, no. 423, and Corbie. For connection with Irish monks, see Warren, p. 16.

[17] *Vita Filiberti*, cc. 2, 25, *M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, V, 585, 597.

actuated by political motives. But a similar case can be cited in Audoen's appointment of Geremar as abbot of Pentali, which was a royal monastery.[18]

However, if Irish influence and tradition are not acceptable as the sole explanation of these charters, how may they be explained? I am not sure that the crumbling of the diocesan organization, which was a phenomenon of the later Merovingian period, would not serve as ample explanation.[19] But if precedent be demanded, it can be furnished almost half a century before Columban set foot in Burgundy. In the forty-sixth chapter of the *Rule* which Aurelian of Arles wrote about 550 A. D. for St. Peter's of Arles, the following sentence appears: "No one may receive the honor of the priesthood or the diaconate except the abbot, if he wishes to be ordained a priest, and one deacon and one subdeacon (and) he has the power of being ordained by whom he wishes and when he wishes".[20] This privilege was probably short-lived, since Aurelian's successor, Sapaudus, presided over the Fifth Council of Arles (554), which reasserted episcopal control over monasteries in the diocese of Arles.[21] At any rate the privilege of applying to any bishop whom the abbot chose was granted many years before the founding of Luxeuil. Whatever the origin of these charters, they made it possible for abbots to take advantage of those *episcopi peregrini* who wandered through Gaul even as late as the ninth century.[22] They might also have one of their own monks ordained bishop for the convenience of monastic ordinations and consecrations.[23] Or they might simply apply for spiritual

[18] *Vita Geremari abbatis Flaviacensis*, c. 8, *ibid.*, IV, 630.

[19] *Vide infra*, pp. 244–245.

[20] Nullus honorem presbyterii aut diaconatus accipiat, præter abbatem si voluerit ordinari presbyterum, et unum diaconem, et subdiaconem, quo ipse voluerit, et quando voluerit, ordinandi habeat potestatem." J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. LXVIII, col. 392.

[21] Charles Joseph Hefele, *Histoire des conciles*, tr. and ed. by H. Leclercq, vol. III, pt. 1, p. 170.

[22] The council of Châlons-sur-Saône (813) forbade consecrations by wandering Irish bishops. Canon 43, in *M. G. H., LL.*, sec. III, *Concilia*, II, 282.

[23] The charters for Murbach and Saint-Dié mentioned such a bishop. In the charter for Murbach, we find: "Cum vero necesse fuerit chrisma petire . . . . aut si de se episcopum habent, aut a quacumque de sanctis episcopis sibi elegerint . . . licentia sit eis petire . . ." (Pardessus, II, 354). In Numerian's charter for Saint-Dié, it is provided: "Et si, quod absit, talis inter abbatem et monachos dissensio aliqua . . . videatur . . . tunc missus episcopus eorum ad alios abbates qui hujusmodi regulam teneant . . ." (*ibid.*, II, 148). In another part of the charter, we find the following: "Nullusque de eodem monasterio seu de parochiis aut ceteris monasteriis absque ulla regula et privilegiis viventibus muneris causa audeat sperare." Friedrich interpreted the "nullusque" to mean "episcopus de eodem monasterio" (*op. cit.*, II, 201 ff.). However, Frank has shown that Friedrich's syntax was faulty (pp. 13–15).

functions to the bishop of a neighboring see. It is generally assumed that the first two possibilities were of Irish provenance.

It is extremely unfortunate for the theory of Irish influence that the monasteries so privileged do not seem to have taken advantage of all possibilities open to them. For with the exception of Murbach, during the lifetime of its founder, Bishop Pirmin,[24] and Saint-Dié, during the life of its abbot, Deodatus,[25] none of the nine monasteries seem to have had a monastery bishop of their own. It is possible that they used the services of wandering bishops. But except for Aid's consecration of the altar of Luxeuil, no specific instance has been recorded in Gaul where consecrations or ordinations were performed by *episcopi peregrini*.[26] However, as Frank has pointed out,[27] the very violence with which Boniface combatted the activity of the *gyrovagi*, as he dubbed them, is evidence enough that such consecrations and ordinations had taken place, and not only in a few privileged monasteries but over wide areas.[28] Consequently, these privileged monasteries may have applied to neighboring bishops, or they may have taken advantage of wandering bishops. But bishops of their own they had none.

As a matter of fact, the only monasteries in Gaul where monk-bishops[29] seem to have lived under the abbot in Irish fashion were

[24] None of Pirmin's successors were monastic bishops. Baldobert seems to have been bishop of Basel and Simpert, bishop of Neuberg (Frank, pp. 113–127). The distinction must be made between bishops who retired to monasteries to end their days as simple monks (*vide infra*, p. 239, n. 30) and those who lived in monasteries for the purpose of performing spiritual functions for the convenience of the monks.

[25] Apparently Deodatus was a bishop: "Et quia venerabilis vir Deodatus episcopus." Pardessus, II, 147. *Cf.* Frank, pp. 109–110.

[26] Actually, the only certain example of such use of a wandering bishop is in the diocese of Salzburg, where a church was consecrated by a "vagantem episcopum nomine Liuti". And Liuti was not an Irishman but a Frank. *Breves notitiae Salisburgenses*, VIII, 10, in *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, W. Hauthaler, ed. (Salzburg, 1908–1910), I, 29.

[27] *Op. cit.*, pp. 20–21, 164.

[28] As specific examples of these wandering bishops, the following might be cited: Falvius, *Vita Sigiramni abbatis Longoretensis*, c. 9, in *M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, IV, 611; and see Krusch's introduction to the *Vita*, p. 604, and his "Zur Florians- und Lupus-Legende", *Neues Archiv*, XXIV (1899), 542; Frank, p. 21; Kilian of Würzburg, who appeared in the list of bishops composed for Charles the Great by Godescalc in 781, Frank, p. 24; and Disibod, *Vita sancti Disibodi* in Migne, vol. CXCVII, cols. 1099, 1106; *cf.* Hauck, I, 311, n. 3; Gougaud, p. 99; Frank, p. 23.

[29] The only other certain example of a monk-bishop is that of the Anglo-Saxon Alubert, whom Gregory, abbot of Saint Martin's of Utrecht, had consecrated to help him in his work. Altfried, *Vita sancti Liudgeri*, c. 10, in *M. G. H., SS.*, II, 407. Frank included Dobdagrec, the Irishman who performed episcopal duties over a period of years for Virgil of Salzburg, pp. 160 ff.; and W. Levison, "Die Iren und die fränkische Kirche", *Historische Zeitschrift*, CIX (1912), p. 16. But Dobdagrec was also abbot of Chiemsee,

Saint-Denis and Saint Martin of Tours.[30] Very little is known of them beyond the mere fact of their existence. They were apparently introduced into Saint-Denis under the abbacy of Fulrad (749–784).[31] For Saint Martin, no specific time of origin can be given. Vaucelle suggests that they appeared there in the late seventh century. But his opinion is admittedly pure conjecture. By the middle of the ninth century, they seem to have disappeared from both monasteries.[32] Some question has

which would lift him out of the category of the simple monk-bishop and place him in that of abbot-bishop. See H. Krabbo, "Bischof Virgil von Salzburg und seine Kosmologie", *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXIV (1903), 10, n. 3, 18.

30 Frank includes Honau and Lobbes in his list, pp. 29–32, 33–37. Honau belonged, with Péronne, Saint Maur-les-Fossés, and Mazerolles, to the purely Irish foundations of the first period of expansion. The testament of its abbot, Beatus, written between 778 and 810, was signed by seven Irish bishops and one Irish priest, all of whom were apparently in residence there at the time (J. D. Schöpflin, ed., *Alsatia diplomata aevi Merovingici, Carolingici, Saxonici, Salici, Suevi* [2 vols., Mannheim, 1772–1775], vol. I, p. 49, no. 51). Frank conjectured that they were in charge of the eight churches belonging to Honau which were enumerated in the will. But this assumption is based only on the coincidence that the number of Irishmen and churches were the same. There is no reason to believe that these seven bishops were any more monastery bishops than the group of retired diocesan bishops which Frank specifically rejects as monk-bishops: Israel, mentioned by Ruotger in his *Vita Brunonis*, c. 7, *M. G. H., SS.*, IV, 257; Markus of St. Gall and his nephew Moengal (Ekkehard IV, *Casus sancti Galli*, *ibid.*, II, 78); Dunchad, the "pontifex Hiberniensis" who lived at Saint Rémi of Rheims; and Markus of Soissons, who retired to become a monk of SS. Médard and Sebastian (Frank, pp. 31–32). And similarly, there is no reason to believe that the three bishops, Abel, Vulgisius, and Amulvinus, who lived at Lobbes in the eighth century, were monk-bishops in the Irish sense. Our one source of information concerning them is this sentence written by Folcuin about 980 A. D.: "Habuit etiam et cooperatores sive successores, eiusdem loci gubernatores et coabbates sanctum utique Abel, Scotum genere, et sanctum Vulgisium episcopum, et dominum Amulvinum aeque episcopum" (*Gesta abbatum Lobiensium*, c. 5, *M. G. H., SS.*, IV, 58). Frank thinks that they were typical monk-bishops (pp. 33–37). However, it is a question whether Abel or Amulvinus were even bishops. If they were, Joseph Warichez thought them to be simply missionary bishops without fixed sees, who stayed at Lobbes for a time (*L'abbaye de Lobbes depuis les origines jusqu'en 1200* [Louvain, 1909], pp. 21–23). It seems more reasonable, in the light of the evidence which he presented, to accept his conclusions rather than Frank's.

31 Michel Félibien, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale de Saint-Denys en France* (Paris, 1706), p. 51; Levillain, "Études sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis à l'époque mérovingienne" [III], *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes*, LXXXVII (1926), 332–337. Both Frank (p. 41) and Levillain (p. 337, n. 4) are of the opinion that the deposed bishop of Embrun, Chramlin, who lived at Saint-Denis in 667, was not a monastery bishop.

32 E. R. Vaucelle, "La collégiale de Saint-Martin de Tours des origines à l'avènement des Valois", *Bulletin et mémoires de la société archéologique de Touraine*, XLVI (1907), 69, 71. Félibien believed that the bishops of Saint-Denis had disappeared by the time of Charles the Bald. This seems quite probable. In Hincmar's *Miracula sancti Dionisii*, he mentioned Bishop Herbert of Saint-Denis of the time of Fulrad in such a way that it

been raised as to their functions. One group of scholars is of the opinion that they were actual monastery bishops endowed with full episcopal powers. Others see in them little more than priests, or chorbishops at best, whose chief functions were to preach to the crowd of pilgrims which swarmed to both monasteries, and to administer the sacraments to them.[33] In the absence of documents, it is hard to form an opinion on the subject. But it seems probable that the functions of the bishops of Saint Martin's were limited to preaching and the spiritual care of pilgrims.[34] At Saint-Denis, this may also have been the case prior to the time of Fulrad, if, indeed, there were bishops of Saint-Denis before his abbacy. But with the bull of Hadrian, the monks of Saint-Denis were permitted to apply to any bishop they wished for the performance of spiritual functions.[35] Consequently, there is no reason why the bishop of Saint-Denis should not have been fully empowered to confer orders and consecrate chrism.

If this analysis is correct, the bishops of Saint Martin's were not actually bishops in the Irish sense of the term, and so need not be further considered. Saint-Denis for about a century seems to have possessed actual monastery bishops, but it is difficult to connect these with any Irish influence. It has been assumed that such influence was at work

would seem that the institution no longer existed at the time he wrote, in 835 (Mabillon, *AA. SS.*, sec. 3, pt. 2, p. 344). Levillain ("Études sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis", p. 338) notes the existence of one "Godofredus episcopus" as late as 838, however, and he concludes that Godofred was the last of the bishops of Saint-Denis. Certainly when Hilduin wrote his *Constitutio* for Saint-Denis in 832, the relationship of the monastery to its diocesan would seem to have been regulated by the original privilege granted in 652 by Landry, bishop of Paris, which reserved spiritual jurisdiction to the diocesan (*cf.* Levillain, "Le formulaire de Marculf et la critique moderne", *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes,* LXXXIV [1923], 46, n. 1, 89), rather than by any papal bulls permitting monastery bishops (*M. G. H., LL.*, sec. III, *Concilia,* II, 689).

[33] Ch. Pfister, *Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux, 996–1031* (Paris, 1885), p. 319, n. 3; Frank, pp. 50–53, 68–69. Pflugk-Harttung, p. 42; Levillain, "Études sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis", pp. 317, 337; Vaucelle, pp. 69–71. Gougaud considers the question debatable. "La question des abbayes-évêchés bretonnes", *Archives de la France monastique, Revue Mabillon,* XII (1922), 98, n. 8.

[34] Vaucelle (pp. 70–71) comes to this conclusion since the episcopal privilege of Ibbo, 720 (Pardessus, no. 512), Adeodatus's bull of 674 (Philippus Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII,* ed. by S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, P. Ewald, no. 2105), and the act of the Council of Tusey, 860, confirming these, all reserve ordinations and consecrations to the diocesan. Vaucelle argues sententiously that if the bishops of Saint Martin's had powers of ordination and consecration, this fact must have appeared in these documents. He concludes, therefore, that Hadrian's bull of 786 granting such powers to the bishops of Saint Martin's was interpolated in the eleventh century, when the canons were in conflict with the archbishop of Tours.

[35] Levillain, "Études sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis", pp. 332–333, 334, n. 1.

through Queen Balthilde, who was instrumental in introducing into the monasteries of Gaul the combined rules of Benedict and Columban.[36] But this took place about 650 A. D., and the bishops of Saint-Denis seem not to have appeared until a hundred years later. The interval of a century might conceivably have diluted any influence which the Irish monks might have exerted through the use of their *Rule*. The Irish institution of monk-bishop can thus hardly be considered prevalent in Merovingian Gaul. Monastery bishops existed for about a century in Saint-Denis, but not because of any Irish influence *per se*. They seem to have been part of the revolt of the monks against the appropriation of the abbacy by the bishop of Paris as part of the spoils of war. And this can scarcely be laid at the door of the Irish.

The story is only slightly different when the Irish institution of abbot-bishop is considered. There are several examples of Irish wandering bishops who became abbots of their own foundations in Gaul.[37] There are also numerous instances of diocesan bishops who absorbed the office of abbot and so fulfilled two functions at once.[38] But there are few cases where a succession of abbots were bishops by virtue of their abbacy, a condition which is the test of the Irish abbot-bishop. Only the monasteries of Stavelot-Malmédy, Lobbes, and possibly Honau come in this category.[39] At Stavelot-Malmédy, there was a succession of four

[36] According to the queen's biographer (*Vita sancti Balthildis*, c. 9, *M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, II, 493), she attempted to introduce the combined rules into the monasteries of Saint Martin's, Saint Germain, Saint Médard, Saint Aignan, Saint-Denis, and Saint Pierre, which Levillain has identified as Saint Pierre-le-Vif of Sens. "Études sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis" [II], *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes*, LXXXVI (1925), 50, n. 1, 77. See also Malnory, p. 34; Frank, p. 38. Yet Vaucelle (p. 36) does not believe that the combined rules were ever introduced into Saint Martin's, but that only the Benedictine *Rule* was used.

[37] For example, Romanus, to whom Mazerolles was given (see the testament of Ansoald, bishop of Poitou, Pardessus, no. 438); Dobdagrec, abbot of Chiemsee, whom Frank nevertheless considers a monk-bishop (*Vita Bertuni, M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, VII, 179 ff.); Rupert of Salzburg and Corbinian of Freising (Frank, pp. 150, 153, 161).

[38] For example, Turnoald, bishop of Paris and abbot of Saint-Denis. Yet see Krusch, "Zur Eptadius", p. 137, and Edgar Loening, *Geschichte der deutschen Kirchenrechts* (2 vols., Strasbourg, 1878), II, 445, who classified him as a true abbot-bishop. For Rapert of Schönewerd and bishop of Basel, see Besson, "Les premiers évêques de Bâle", *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte*, XII (1918), 222. Five bishops of monasteries signed at the synod of Attigny, 760–762 (*M. G. H., LL*, sec. II, *Capitularia*, I, 221). These were Williharius, bishop of Saint Maurice; Theodulf, bishop of Lobbes; Hippolitus, bishop of Saint Claude; Jacob, bishop of Hornbach; and Willibald, bishop of Eichstätt. In a careful discussion (pp. 136–140) Frank has identified these men.

[39] Frank sees a similar abbot-bishop in Amand of Elno, pp. 92–96, 165. The case rests on such doubtful grounds, however, that I hesitate to include Amand in this category. Warichez (p. 25) considered him a missionary bishop.

abbots who were bishops, in the first quarter of the eighth century. The later abbot-bishops of Stavelot-Malmédy were all diocesan bishops who had appropriated the office of abbot.[40] At Honau, it is possible that its founder, Benedict, was a bishop. Of his successors, it is certain that only Duban was a monastery bishop. At Lobbes, the abbots Ursmar, Ermino, and Theodulf (d. 776) were also bishops. Warichez points out, however, that they did not receive the episcopate on the same terms. Ursmar owed his rank to the fact that he was a missionary. He was a bishop *ad praedicandum*, a regionary bishop, whose episcopate preceded his office as abbot. Only Ermino and Theodulf can be considered actual monastery bishops of Lobbes. After Theodulf, the others who were both abbot and bishop were all diocesan bishops.[41]

It is possible to attribute this combination of functions to Irish influence at Stavelot-Malmédy and Honau. Remaclus came to the former from Solignac.[42] Honau was an Irish monastery from its foundation. But there is no certainty that Irish custom was responsible for the abbot-bishops of Lobbes. Ursmar, Ermino, and Theodulf were not of Irish origin.[43] There is not even assurance that Lobbes was governed by the combined rules of Columban and Benedict. It has been argued that such was the case. The reasons advanced are that the Benedictine *Rule* was unknown in Belgium; that the combination of abbatial and episcopal offices was an Irish custom; that one Dodo, a monk of Lobbes, held private property. And therefore, the combined rules must have been in effect at Lobbes. This logic would not seem to be startlingly conclusive in itself. And Warichez has quickly disposed of it.[44]

Thus it is practically impossible to connect the disintegration of Merovingian diocesan organization with Irish monastic custom transplanted to the Continent. It may be that the Irish custom of monastery bishop was seized upon as an answer to the needs either of a missionary center or of a famous shrine. We can never know to what extent the idea of monastery bishop was in the air. But until our meager sources of information are amplified, it seems hardly justifiable to hold the Irish

[40] Remaclus, Godoin, Papolenus, and Ravanger. See Krusch's introduction to the *Vita Remacli, M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, V, 88 ff., wherein he reverses his opinion, stated in "Zur Eptadius", p. 136, that Papolenus was the first abbot-bishop of Stavelot-Malmédy. And *cf.* Hauck, I, 311, n. 3; Levison, p. 16; Frank, pp. 82–89.

[41] Hauck, *loc. cit.*; Loening, II, 445; Frank, pp. 97–109; Warichez, pp. 16–29.

[42] *Vita Remacli*, c. 1 in *M. G. H., SS. rer. Mer.*, V, 104.

[43] Ursmar was born at Floyon in the Hainaut, *Vita Ursmari*, c. 1, *ibid.*, VI, 453. Ermino was born of Frankish parents at Laon, *Vita Erminonis*, c. 1, *ibid.*, p. 462.

[44] See note to *Vita sancti Dodonis*, c. 13, *AA. SS. Boll.*, Oct., XII, 630. But see Warichez, pp. 27–29.

monks responsible for needs to which one of their customs may have been an answer. For it was not the answer but the needs with which Frankish ecclesiastical organization could not cope, which broke down the diocese as a unit of administration in Merovingian Gaul.

There was one way in which impact of Irish monasticism may have weakened the diocesan organization, not by episcopal charters nor settled monastery bishops, but through those wandering bishops, the *peregrini* already mentioned, who went from place to place, consecrating and ordaining as occasions arose. Actual instances of their ministrations are rare. But the constant reiteration of councils [45] and the exasperation in Boniface's letters [46] are fair evidence of their activity. Here at least is tangible influence at work. Had they confined their activities to monasteries whose abbots were privileged to apply to any bishop they wished, there could have been no complaint. Operating for the most part in unprivileged monasteries, these *episcopi peregrini* must have brought confusion with them into Frankish dioceses. They were common enough, or powerful enough, to inspire Frankish imitators.[47] One might well seize upon this wandering episcopate as the reason for the downfall of the Frankish diocese. If spiritual powers could be exercised by the first doughty Gael who appeared, what need could there be for a diocesan bishop with his pretensions and his attempts to subordinate hapless monasteries to his episcopal see? Yet it is my contention that the very appearance of these wandering bishops was the result, and not the cause, of the disintegration of the Church in Gaul.

[45] The first mention of *episcopi vagantes* was in 755 (Council of Ver, canon 13, in Hefele, vol. III, pt. 2, p. 937). Similar prohibitions were made at the Council of Verberie, 756 (c. 14, *ibid.*, p. 919), and at the Council of Châlons-sur-Saône, 813 (c. 43, *ibid.*, p. 1145). Earlier councils contained provisions against "unknown" clergy (Council of 742, c. 4, *ibid.*, p. 823; Council of Soissons, 744, c. 5, *ibid.*, p. 858). The councils of the seventh century stipulated that there should be but one bishop to a city (Council of Saint Jean-de-Losne, 670–673, c. 6, *ibid.*, pt. 1, p. 301; Council of Châlons-sur-Saône, 639–654, *ibid.*, p. 283; and Council of Paris, 614, c. 3, *ibid.*, p. 251). Frank has assumed that the councils of the seventh century were leveling these canons against the wandering Irish bishops (p. 22). This is possible. But he neglected to note an exactly similar provision of the Third Council of Orléans, 538, which antedated the arrival of the Irish by half a century (c. 16, *M. G. H., LL.*, sec. III, *Concilia*, I, 78). It is difficult to determine accurately what was meant by the councils of the seventh century. So that it seems best not to carry conciliar legislation respecting the Irish wandering bishops back of the reforming synods of the middle eighth century.

[46] Especially his letter of 748 to Pope Zachary, *M. G. H., Epp.*, III, 356–361.

[47] Thus Liuti, who consecrated a church in the diocese of Salzburg (*vide supra*, p. 238, n. 26), and Desiderius, who was said to have come from the Elsgau. However, we have little evidence that Desiderius was even a bishop or came from the Elsgau. *Cf.* Frank, pp. 25, 26; Levison, "Kleine Beiträge zu Quellen der fränkischen Geschichte" [III], *Neues Archiv*, XXVII (1902), 390 ff.

To discern the nature of this disintegration, it is necessary only to turn to Boniface's letters and the provisions of those reforming councils held at his instigation. From these it would seem that Catholic Christianity was practically non-existent in the second half of the eighth century. The church councils, which had been so numerous and so influential in the sixth and early seventh centuries, had almost ceased.[48] Dioceses were unoccupied for years at a time or were in the hands of laymen, who held several bishoprics and monasteries at once.[49] Murder and concubinage constituted no bar to advancement in the hierarchy.[50] Bishops turned warriors and hunters of beast and man alike. Pagan rites and superstitions abounded.[51]

The widespread depravity sketched by Boniface can scarcely be attributed to the Irish monks. Whatever their imperfections in matters of tonsure or Easter observance, they could scarcely have been accused of moral laxity. Nor can the long intervals between councils or the secularization of the Church be laid at their door. These abuses would seem to have been symptoms of a change far greater than that which wandering bishops could have effected. The Merovingian dynasty was in the throes of its death struggle. Partisans were to be bought, and Karl Martel had shown with what effectiveness episcopal sees and rich monasteries could be bartered for service on the battlefield. The Merovingian Church was thus deprived of any real spiritual leadership. Small wonder if a grizzled war dog failed to suppress in his diocese pagan superstitions which governed his own conduct, or sanctioned among his clergy the same licentiousness of which he himself boasted. The social and moral responsibilities of the religious life would thus

[48] Boniface estimated that they had not met for eighty years (*M. G. H., Epp.*, III, 299). But this is accurate only for the eastern provinces. Councils continued to be held, although few in number, throughout the seventh century. *Cf.* E. Vacandard, *La vie de Saint Ouen, évêque de Rouen* (Paris, 1902), p. 222, n.

[49] Hugh, nephew of Charles Martel, was at the same time bishop of Paris, Rouen, and Bayeux, and abbot of Saint Wandrille and Jumièges. One Milo was bishop of Rheims and Trier. For other examples, see John Joseph Laux, *Der heilige Bonifatius, Apostel der Deutschen* (Freiburg i. B., 1922), p. 142. And *cf.* Council of Leptinnes (743), c. 1, Hefele, vol. III, pt. 2, p. 827.

[50] "Modo autem maxima ex parte per civitates episcopales sedes traditae sunt laicis cupidis ad possidendum vel adulteratis clericis, scortatoribus et publicanis, seculariter ad perfruendum." Boniface, *M. G. H., Epp.*, III, 299. And *cf.* Council of Soissons (744), c. 8, in Hefele, vol. III, pt. 2, p. 858.

[51] ". . . [episcopi] qui pugnant in exercitu armati et effudebant propria manu sanguinem hominum, sive paganorum sive christianorum" (*M. G. H., Epp.*, III, 300). *Cf.* Council of 742, cc. 2, 5, in Hefele, vol. III, pt. 2, pp. 822, 823; Council of Leptinnes (743). c. 4, *ibid.*, p. 833; Council of Soissons (744), c. 6, *ibid.*, p. 858.

seem to have rested most lightly on the very men who should have shouldered them with greatest seriousness. The breakdown of the Church being but one aspect of a more general decay, it seems more logical to see in wandering bishop or special privilege an indication of this decay rather than to attribute the decay to the influence of a group of foreign missionaries.

What, then, was the influence of the Irish monks on the organization of the Merovingian diocese? If the authenticity of all nine charters releasing monasteries from the spiritual authority of their diocesans be accepted, an argument can be made for the Irish origin of such privileges. I believe, however, that regardless of the question of authenticity, more cogent reasons can be offered against such Irish influence: The majority of Irish monasteries were not so privileged; Audoen, disciple of Columban, did not recognize any independence of his spiritual jurisdiction on the part of monasteries in his diocese; and the first such privilege was granted half a century before Columban set foot in Burgundy. It would seem, too, that it is difficult to connect monastery bishops in non-Irish monasteries with Irish influence. Consequently, Irish influence must be confined to the elusive work of the *episcopi peregrini*. Where these wanderers performed spiritual functions for unprivileged monasteries, their actions were subversive of the jurisdiction of the diocesan concerned. But had the organization of the Merovingian diocese been in a healthy state, the wandering bishops would never have been able to function. Therefore, their activity should be considered an indication rather than a cause of the decay.

Helen Robbins Bittermann.

Columbus, Ohio.

FUR TRADE STRATEGY AND THE AMERICAN LEFT FLANK IN THE WAR OF 1812

THE northern military frontier in the War of 1812 has usually been thought of, and treated by the historians on both sides, as terminating westwardly at Detroit. The evacuation of Fort Dearborn, the early loss of Michilimackinac and the failure of the attempt to retake it, have of course received some attention; and the capture and subsequent loss of Prairie du Chien in the summer of 1814 have been rather fully told by local historians and received slight mention in the general histories. But the fact that the United States had a continuous frontier stretching from Ohio to St. Louis and even many miles beyond on the Missouri River appears to have been almost completely overlooked. Along this frontier, especially in the territories of Illinois and Missouri, American settlements were constantly assailed by Indian tribes in alliance with the British. This was the true American left flank throughout the war. Nor was the war here merely one of border raids. To the British and Canadians, at least, it was a war for control of the vast fur trade area of the Northwest. If the western United States went to war to conquer Canada, the Canadian fur companies and their numerous agents were equally explicit in their desire to thrust back the boundaries of the United States and make their own the Indian country from Lake Huron to the Missouri River; and British officers in Canada sympathized with and supported this desire. Thus the British, the fur traders, who took a prominent part in the war in this area, and their Indian allies were, in their own conception, waging a war of conquest, though the Americans seem never to have quite realized this fact.

Why has the history of the war in this segment of the frontier been neglected? Largely, no doubt, because few men were engaged in it and because it had no influence upon the terms of peace; the British victors found their work utterly overlooked at the peace negotiations; partly, too, because, while the Canadian documents essential to a study of it have been generously published, the corresponding American papers have lain unpublished and none too easily accessible in the War Department and the Indian Office. An examination of these unpublished documents makes possible an attempt to put together the story of the war on the American left flank.[1]

[1] A great amount of pertinent material from the Canadian archives is published in the *Historical Collections* of the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society (hereinafter,

The attempt of the British government to gain direct access to the upper Mississippi River failed with the signature of Jay's Treaty in 1794[2]. What the government had failed to do directly, however, British fur traders proceeded to accomplish indirectly. Plying their trade across the international boundary, as permitted by Article III of the Jay Treaty, these enterprising gentry took full possession of the route via the Strait of Mackinac, Lake Michigan, and Green Bay, and from the southern tip of the latter by the Fox and Wisconsin rivers to Prairie du Chien, where the Wisconsin empties into the Mississippi. From the strategic settlements at Green Bay and Prairie du Chien, they firmly established their supremacy in trade and politics among the Wisconsin Indians and even those beyond the Mississippi. Zebulon M. Pike in his search for the source of the Mississippi in 1805–1806 found the country full of these British traders, who seemed unaware that they were on the soil of the United States.[3] A description, written in 1809, of the trade and methods of the North West Company told how even the Plains Indians of the upper Louisiana Purchase territory were held in British allegiance by the "presents of Rum, arms and amunition which they receive at stated

M. P. H. Coll.), Lansing, vols. XV (1890), XVI (1890), XXIII (1895), and XXV (1896) and in the *Collections* of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (hereinafter, *W. H. Coll.*), Madison, vols. III (1857), IX (1882), X (1888), XI (1888), XII (1892), and XIII (1895). Many of the same documents and some additional ones are summarized in the *Reports of the Public Archives,* Dominion of Canada, Ottawa, especially those for 1893 and 1896. *Select British Documents of the Canadian War of 1812,* edited by Colonel William Wood and published in three volumes by the Champlain Society, Toronto, 1920–1928, contain little material on this subject not previously published. Letters and reports of American army officers and territorial governors to the Secretary of War lie in files in the War Department, tied in packages with ancient red tape. Outgoing military correspondence was copied in volumes known as Military Books (so cited hereafter); that which pertained primarily to Indian affairs was similarly copied, for the period 1812–1815, in Letter Book C (so cited hereafter) in the Indian Office, and is now found in the Department of the Interior. A small amount of pertinent material is also to be found in the Department of State. This includes some correspondence between that department and territorial governors, and a collection known as Intercepted Correspondence, 1812, most or all of which consists of papers captured from General Proctor at the Battle of the Thames in 1813. Many of these papers duplicate published material from the Canadian archives. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the courteous and helpful assistance rendered by those in charge of the files of the Departments of State, War, and Interior.

[2] Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Jay's Treaty: a Study in Commerce and Diplomacy* (New York, 1923), pp. 239–242.

[3] Elliott Coues, ed., *The Expeditions of Zebulon Montgomery Pike* (3 vols., New York, 1895), I, 247–250. *Cf.* Frederick J. Turner, *The Character and Influence of the Indian Trade in Wisconsin,* in the Johns Hopkins University Studies, Ninth series (Baltimore, 1891), p. 49 [589].

periods", in return for which they supplied the meat and tallow of deer and buffalo to the company's servants.[4] Secretary of War Eustis was informed in the same year that British merchants had deposited at Prairie du Chien ten or twelve thousand pounds of powder and an equivalent quantity of musket bullets, which would be dealt out to the Indians in the event of war with the United States.[5]

This sort of activity was, of course, far from agreeable to the government of the United States, and various measures were adopted to break the monopoly of the British traders and destroy or counteract their influence with the Indians. When Louisiana passed into American hands, the United States took the position that the liberties allowed by the Jay Treaty did not extend to the new territory, and alien traders were warned to keep out of the Missouri River region or else to take the oath of allegiance to the United States—a prohibition which some of the North West partners complained in 1808 was being rigidly enforced.[6] Government "factories" for the Indian trade were, moreover, established by 1808 or before at Michilimackinac, Chicago, Fort Osage, and Fort Madison—the last named on the Mississippi in what is now Iowa—in the hope of winning the Indians by better goods and fairer prices than could be offered by the private traders. In 1808, also, John Jacob Astor's American Fur Company inaugurated its competition with the Montreal merchants.[7] During the time of the Embargo and subsequent Non-Intercourse Acts—that is, during most of the time from December, 1807, to the beginning of hostilities in 1812—British traders and their cargoes were, as nearly as possible, excluded from the United States.[8] The result was a heightening of ill feeling on both sides. Enforcement of the new restrictions was sufficient to interfere seriously with British trade activities, but insufficient to prevent much smuggling or to weaken British influence with the Indians.

[4] *Report of the Public Archives,* 1928, Dominion of Canada, pp. 68–69. This document—appendix E (pp. 56–73)—is attributed to Duncan McGillivray. Prairie du Chien was not in the territory at this time worked by the North West Company, and the influence described was probably exerted from posts farther north. That it was effective on the Indians west of Prairie du Chien there can be no doubt.

[5] American Historical Association, *Annual Report,* 1909, pp. 403–404.

[6] Wayne E. Stevens, "Fur Trading Companies in the Northwest, 1760–1816", Mississippi Valley Historical Association, *Proceedings,* IX (1918), 283–291; Gordon Charles Davidson, *The North West Company* (Berkeley, 1918), pp. 289–290; *M. P. H. Coll.,* XXV, 217. *Cf.* British complaints in *ibid.,* XXV, 256–257.

[7] Stevens, *loc. cit.;* Jacob Van der Zee, "Fur Trade Operations in the Eastern Iowa Country from 1800 to 1833", *Iowa Journal of History,* XII (1914), 495–504. *American State Papers, Indian Affairs,* I, 768.

[8] *M. P. H. Coll.,* XXV, 250–256. Davidson, *loc. cit.*

In 1806 the Montreal merchants interested in the fur trade of the Michigan-Wisconsin-Minnesota area had organized the Michilimackinac Company, modeled upon the North West Company, which now abandoned for the most part the trade south of the Canadian border.[9] The new company was so hampered by the American restrictions that in 1810 its members made an arrangement with Astor by which their interests were merged with those of the American Fur Company under the name of the South West Fur Company. Trading goods were to be furnished in equal parts by the Montreal merchants by way of Quebec and by Astor from New York, and the proceeds of the trade were to be equally divided.[10] Presumably the Montreal people hoped by the merger with Astor to overcome the difficulties set in their way by the United States government. If so, their hopes were disappointed; and, as will be shown, the South West Company, despite Astor's part in it, remained thoroughly British in attitude.

Nonintercourse with Great Britain, abandoned in the spring of 1810, was revived on February 2, 1811. This must have been known within a few weeks to the Montreal merchants of the South West Company. Nevertheless, in the summer of 1811, possibly hoping for the repeal of the law, they forwarded the usual supply of goods to the emporium at St. Joseph at the head of Lake Huron. Between this post and their destination west of Lake Michigan was the United States custom house and garrison at Michilimackinac, guarding the entrance to Lake Michigan. Because of the Non-Intercourse Act it appeared that the merchandise must remain at St. Joseph unsold.[11] From this situation the company was partly relieved by the enterprise and ingenuity of the Indian trader, Robert Dickson. Loading seven boats with goods worth £10,000, Dickson and his party slipped by the American post under cover of darkness, and eventually arrived safely at their trading grounds at Green Bay and Prairie du Chien.[12]

The existence of this clandestine trade and the continual ascendancy

[9] The story of these companies is concisely told by Stevens, *op. cit.* The new company was not a competitor of the North West Company; the two were made up largely of the same Montreal firms.

[10] Stevens, *loc. cit.* Kenneth Wiggins Porter, *John Jacob Astor, Business Man* (Cambridge, 1931), I, 253–255.

[11] Milo M. Quaife, ed., *The John Askin Papers* (2 vols., Detroit, 1928, 1931), II, 694.

[12] *Ibid.*, II, 696. *M. P. H. Coll.*, XV, 193. *W. H. Coll.*, IX, 178. The last reference is to the account of T. G. Anderson, who was with Dickson. The figures are from his narrative, which was written many years later, and may not be accurate. William Clark wrote Secretary Eustis that Dickson had "smuggled an emence quantity of goods" by way of Green Bay. Clark to Eustis, Feb. 13, 1812, MSS., War Dept.

which it gave the British among the western Indians were well known to the United States government, which, months before the opening of the war, was contemplating measures to terminate both. The area concerned comprised northern Illinois and Wisconsin, the northern peninsula of Michigan, and adjoining parts of Iowa and Minnesota. This region had been surrounded on three sides by the American posts and factories at Michilimackinac, Chicago, and Fort Madison and had in theory been cut off from the British by the Non-Intercourse Act, and yet British trade and British influence continued to prevail. It was now proposed to push into the heart of the country and establish a trading post and garrison at Prairie du Chien itself.

This course was suggested at least as early as February 2, 1811, when the Indian agent, Nicholas Boilvin, urged Secretary Eustis to station at least two companies of soldiers at Prairie du Chien and to encourage the Indians to develop the neighboring lead mines—a course which he believed would make them dependent upon the United States instead of the British and Canadians.[13] Benjamin Howard, governor, and William Clark, brigadier general of militia, of Louisiana Territory, urged the same course upon the War Department. Clark believed a garrison on the Fox River near Green Bay would be even more effectual than one at Prairie du Chien in cutting off the Canadian traders, but thought that one at the latter place would produce "valuable effects" on the minds of the Indians, and Governor Howard thought the seizure of Prairie du Chien "indispensable to hold the British Traders in check". The War Department was convinced of the wisdom of the course proposed by Clark and Howard, and on April 13, 1812, informed the latter that a post would be established at Prairie du Chien to be garrisoned by recruits from Kentucky as soon as they were sufficient in number.[14]

The bold proposal to push a garrison six or seven hundred miles into what was in effect the enemy's country was not to be carried out for more than two years, and not successfully even then. It was superseded by the need of providing defense for the frontier nearer home. War with Great Britain was almost certainly approaching, and war with the Indians was already a reality. The battle of Tippecanoe had been fought on November 7, 1811, and the influence of Tecumseh radiated among the Indians far to the west of the Wabash. The Winnebago were already on the warpath, at least in desultory fashion, and Clark feared that

[13] *W. H. Coll.*, XI, 247–253.

[14] Clark to Eustis, Feb. 13, Mar. 22, 1812; Howard to Eustis, Mar. 19, 1812, MSS., War Dept. Letter Book C, p. 126.

Tecumseh's influence would prevail with the Kickapoo, Pottawotamy, Sauk, and Sioux.[15] To keep as many as possible of the tribes at peace and to guard the frontier settlements against those who went to war became the primary object of the officials responsible for the safety of Illinois and Louisiana territories.

A special instrument for frontier defense was provided by Congress, which on January 2, 1812, authorized the President to raise six companies of rangers for the protection of any state or territory threatened with Indian invasion. Each company was to consist of sixty privates, eight noncommissioned and four commissioned officers, enlisted for one year and to serve on foot or horseback as the service might require. The number of companies was presently increased to seven, and in February, 1813, ten additional companies were authorized, each of the new companies to consist of slightly over one hundred officers and men.[16] Companies of rangers were promptly organized for the defense of the northwestern frontier. General Clark recommended to Secretary Eustis, February 13, 1812, that the Missouri-Illinois frontier could best be protected by companies of rangers to be kept constantly in motion some distance in advance of the frontiers of the two adjoining territories; and Governor Howard, apparently without waiting for express authorization, organized a company under Nathan Boone as captain, to patrol the frontier from the Missouri River to the Illinois.[17] In due course of time, the War Department ordered the raising of seven companies of rangers, one each in Indiana, Illinois, and Louisiana territories, two in Ohio, and one each in Kentucky and Tennessee.[18] The five companies raised in Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois were placed under the command of Colonel William Russell, a veteran of the battle of King's Mountain, who also commanded the regular troops in Indiana Territory, and he was instructed to "take an advanced post, and cover the settlements".[19]

[15] Letters of Clark and Howard, cited above. Also *A. S. P., Ind. Aff.*, I, 805–808.

[16] *Annals of Congress,* 12 Cong., 1 sess., cols. 2228, 2345; 12 Cong., 2 sess., col. 1334; 13 Cong., 2 sess., pt. 2, col. 2764.

[17] Clark to Eustis, Feb. 13, 1812; Howard to Eustis, Mar. 19, 1812, MSS., War Dept.

[18] Letter Book C, pp. 114–116, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 140. The dates range from Feb. 28, 1812, for Indiana to July 11, 1812, for Tennessee.

[19] War Dept. to Gov. Harrison, May 2, 1812, *ibid.*, p. 128. Ninian W. Edwards, *History of Illinois from 1778 to 1833; and Life and Times of Ninian Edwards* (Springfield, 1870), p. 342. A report of the strength and distribution of the army as of July 1, 1814, showed 531 rangers, 388 of them "effectives", in Military District No. 8, comprising Kentucky, Ohio, and the four territories in the Northwest. *A. S. P., Mil. Aff.*, I, 535.

Governor Howard was acting with energy for the protection of his segment of the frontier. In addition to the rangers under Captain Boone, he reported in March that he had raised three companies of cavalry and had the militia under requisition. During the spring he erected a new fort, Fort Mason, on the Mississippi at the mouth of the Jefferson River, about 120 miles above St. Louis, and by June believed that this new post and the activity of the rangers made the Missouri frontier secure. Similar measures were taken by Governor Edwards of Illinois, in concert with Howard. By May Edwards had a company of rangers on patrol duty from the Mississippi opposite Fort Mason to the Illinois, at the mouth of the Sangamon, and a volunteer company of mounted riflemen similarly employed from the Illinois to the Kaskaskia.[20] Howard's work and plans were approved in Washington, and he was informed that as soon as possible military posts would be established on the Miami of the Lakes and at Peoria on the upper Illinois, which, with the movements of the rangers, would give adequate protection to the settlements against Indian attacks.[21] Thus an advanced line was projected, to extend from Detroit via the Miami of the Lakes (or Maumee) and Peoria to Fort Mason on the Mississippi and Fort Osage on the Missouri, to be held by garrisons at the posts named and patrolled by rangers. Little was done at the time, however, except to set the rangers in motion. Hull's surrender at Detroit dislodged the eastern end of the line, and the occupation of Peoria was long delayed.

Meanwhile, through William Clark, an attempt was made to secure the friendship of the Indians of Louisiana Territory and dissuade them from taking part in the approaching hostilities.[22] Leading warriors of the various nations of the territory were invited to visit Washington under Clark's guidance. Robert Dickson, the Canadian trader, exerted all his influence to prevent the Indians of the upper Mississippi from accepting the invitation, and so successful was he that of the northern Indians only the Sauk and Fox sent delegates. With these and with representatives of the Great and Little Osage and Shawnee nations—twenty-seven in all—Clark visited Washington in the summer of 1812. The chiefs were entertained and given presents and conducted back to St. Louis, whence, in November, they were sent home. Clark reported

[20] Howard to Eustis, Mar. 19, June 14, 1812, MSS., War Dept. Edwards, pp. 313–314, 329.

[21] Letter Book C, p.126.

[22] In addition to being brigadier general and inspector general of militia for Louisiana Territory, Clark was also superintendent of Indian affairs. Reuben Gold Thwaites, "William Clark, Soldier, Explorer, Statesman", *Washington Historical Quarterly*, I (1907), 234–251.

that they were "well impressed", but the mission had little importance.[23]

American policy at the opening of the War of 1812 may be briefly summarized. Its aims were, as far as possible, to keep the Indians neutral; to make safe the frontier, from Ohio to the Missouri River, by a system of fortified posts and ranger patrols; and finally, whenever it should be possible, to establish a post at Prairie du Chien, thereby destroying British influence among the Sauk and Fox, Winnebago, Menominee, Sioux, and less important tribes who resorted there for trade. There is no evidence that Americans were thinking of the capture of the fur trade as an end in itself; it was the influence exerted through that trade over the Indians which made the ousting of the Canadian traders seem imperative.

On the British side, in this theater of war, the interests of the fur trade and the influence and power of the traders were factors of great weight. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the great fur companies dictated policy and their agents executed it. The embarrassments of the companies trading in the territory of the United States have been described. War offered an opportunity of swift alleviation.

In January, 1812, Mr. A. Gray, acting deputy quartermaster-general for the British army in Canada, reported to the governor, Sir George Prevost, the substance of conversations with the heads of both the North West and South West companies at Montreal. These gentlemen, he stated, were "exceedingly grateful" to the governor for his interest in the protection of their trade, and would "enter with zeal into any measure of Defence, *or even offence,* that may be proposed to them". They were in a position to furnish to the government both naval and military cooperation on Lake Huron, which they believed would be adequate to exclude the United States "from any participation in the navigation or Commerce of Lakes Superior, Huron and Michigan", and they suggested as a means to that end the reduction of the American post at Michilimackinac—that thorn in the side of the fur companies. The companies were full of loyalty, zeal, and public spirit. Mr. Gray recommended that they be formed into two volunteer corps and their officers commissioned, and he added the ominous suggestion: "By means of these Companies, we might let loose the Indians upon them [the United States] throughout the whole Extent of their Western frontier, as they

[23] Clark to Eustis, June 25, Aug. 26, Sept. 16, Oct. 24, Dec. 5, 1812, MSS., War Dept. Dickson's connection with the episode is related in *M. P. H. Coll.,* XV, 180–182. Clark later claimed that the Sioux bands had been influenced in favor of the United States by "the impressions made on those chiefs who visited the president in 1812". Clark to Armstrong, June 28, 1814, MSS., War Dept.

have a most Commanding influence over them."[24] It is to be inferred that the Montreal heads of the South West Company did not consult Mr. Astor, their American partner, upon matters of political and military policy.

The first stroke of the war was precisely that desired by the fur companies, which materially assisted in its execution. Captain Charles Roberts, British commandant at St. Joseph, acting under discretionary orders from General Brock, landed upon Mackinac Island in the early hours of July 17, 1812, and without firing a shot secured the surrender of the American fort. With him were 150 *engagés* of the North West Company and 300 Indians—chiefly Sioux, Menominee, and Winnebago from Prairie du Chien and Green Bay—led by Robert Dickson.[25] No longer would the American fort and custom house bar the way to Lake Michigan and the Mississippi. The British now had, as Dickson put it, the means of "retaining and supporting all the Indian Tribes in their present happy disposition so favourable to the interests of Britain".[26]

No sooner was Michilimackinac taken, than Dickson's Indians, in company with "the gentlemen of the Northwest and Southwest Companies" assembled there, formed an expedition to coöperate with General Brock against Hull at Detroit. They did not arrive in time to be of direct service, but their known approach was a factor in Hull's decision to surrender.[27] The capture of Mackinac and Detroit, the evacuation of Chicago by the Americans, and the repulse of American attacks on the Niagara and St. Lawrence rivers—all occurring in the summer and fall of 1812—gave the British full control of every point on the long line of communications from Montreal to the Wisconsin country.

The British now began to formulate a policy with an immediate and an ultimate objective. The immediate objective was to retain the friendship and allegiance of the western Indians and to use them in what was euphemistically termed defensive war. In December, 1812, Robert Dickson visited Quebec and there, upon the enthusiastic recommendation of the Montreal fur traders and several officers of the British army,[28] was appointed agent for the Indians of the nations west of Lake Huron.

[24] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XV, 70–72.

[25] *Ibid.*, XV, 101–102, 109; *W. H. Coll.*, III, 268–269.

[26] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XV, 103. [27] *Ibid.*, XV, 181–182.

[28] *Ibid.*, XV, 180–182, 202–204. R. McDouall to Gen. Proctor, Mar. 29, 1813, Intercepted Correspondence, 1812, MSS., Dept. of State. The long career of Robert Dickson was treated briefly by E. A. Cruikshank in a paper entitled "Robert Dickson, the Indian Trader", *W. H. Coll.*, XII, 133–153. More recently it was made the subject of a doctoral dissertation at the University of Minnesota by Louis Arthur Tohill, whose *Robert Dickson, British Fur Trader on the Upper Mississippi: a Story of Trade, War, and Diplomacy*, was mimeographed at Ann Arbor, 1926.

In instructions signed by General Prevost, Dickson was informed that the chief purpose of his appointment was to enable him to collect an efficient Indian force for use where circumstances might direct in the province of Upper Canada. Prevost had previously instructed Brock to use Indians only for purposes of defense.[29] Dickson was now told to restrain them from acts of cruelty and inhumanity, but the conception of a purely defensive war was abandoned, if it had ever been really held. Here appears the second and ultimate British objective. In accord with a suggestion made by Dickson himself, he was told to instruct the Indians that they should demand that all Americans, whether in arms or not, retire beyond the line of Wayne's treaty of 1795, except where additional reservations had been granted by treaty, upon pain of being treated as enemies; but, it was added, "it is to be clearly understood that the Indians only are to appear as the movers in such proceedings".[30] Thus, by a demand coming ostensibly from the Indians but really from the British, the American frontier was to be forced back as nearly as possible to the line of the treaty of Greenville. That this policy was thought of as a preliminary to a revision of the boundary between the United States and Canada is clear. "We might", Prevost had written to Earl Bathurst, "engage to make use of our influence to quiet and restrain the Indians provided the government of America will agree to such a boundary between the two territories as shall be thought reasonable and will at the same time engage sacredly to respect it".[31] It was being argued in Canada that the retention of Michigan and Illinois was essential to the safety of the upper province, that without them it would be subject to invasion at any time, while with them it would be impregnable; that to surrender them, with their rich possibilities as farming country and as a market for British manufactures, would be to give up the fairest countries east of the Mississippi as well as to lose for all time the allegiance of the Indians.[32]

Dickson, meanwhile, pushed his work with some energy and success.

[29] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXV, 360.

[30] Prevost to Dickson, Jan. 14, 1813, *ibid.*, XV, 208–209, 219–221.

[31] *Ibid.*, XXV, 359. To this communication from Prevost Bathurst replied, December 9, 1812, that he entirely concurred in Prevost's suggestions as to securing the Indian territories from encroachments, and that he had submitted the dispatch to the secretary of state for foreign affairs "in order that whenever negociations for Peace may be entered into the security of the Indian Possessions may not be either compromised or forgotten". Wood, III, 719.

[32] An unsigned, undated memorandum, found in the papers of General Proctor after the battle of the Thames, Intercepted Correspondence, 1812. The argument is in part similar to that used for a revision of the line from the lakes to the Mississippi prior to Jay's Treaty. *Cf.* Bemis, *Jay's Treaty, loc. cit.* *Cf.* also *post*, p. 270–271.

In the spring of 1813 he journeyed westward by way of Chicago and disappeared in the Wisconsin country. In June he arrived at Mackinac with 623 warriors—Chippewa, Menominee, Ottawa, Sioux, Fox, and Winnebago—and the news that he had sent eight hundred more to Detroit by land. These bands participated in the fighting at Fort Meigs and Fort Stephenson in May and August, 1813,[33] where they proved not only intractable but rather useless in the face of well-defended fortifications. After Perry's victory on Lake Erie, most of them scuttled home. In the spring of 1814 Dickson led a band of two hundred from Green Bay and Prairie du Chien to Mackinac, where they assisted in foiling an American attack. Opinions of the value of the Indian warriors were various. They were a "warlike and determined race", said Prevost, quoting McDouall. His aid-de-camp, Boucherville, on the other hand, thought dependence on them very precarious—"the least failure on our part, discourages them, & at best they are but a barbarous ally, respecting neither sex nor age". Their presence at posts or army camps was "an intolerable burthen", and British officers were at times anxious to be rid of them.[34]

However useful or useless they might be—and British opinion was unanimous that at least their friendship must be retained—the Wisconsin and Minnesota tribes could be held in allegiance only by supplying them with merchandise and ammunition. Communications were vital, and as the normal route lay through Lake Erie, the Detroit River, and Lake Huron, the destruction of the British fleet on Lake Erie in September, 1813, endangered the whole structure of Indian alliance built up by Dickson. The effects of that disaster were felt almost at once at Michilimackinac. "Starvation stares us in the face", wrote John Askin, jr., from that post, in January, 1814; ". . . . no provisions, except fish, can be purchased. The lower class of people subsist solely on the fish they daily get from their nets; and when the ice goes away, they must leave the country, or starve."[35]

The deeper implications of the disaster on Lake Erie were promptly seen as far away as London. Writing from Downing Street on December 3, 1813, Earl Bathurst warned Prevost that enemy superiority on Lake Erie, if maintained, might necessitate a temporary abandonment of the more distant posts, and that the consequent obstruction of intercourse with the Indians might lead them to renounce their allegiance. "The

[33] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XV, 315–316, 321, 323. *W. H. Coll.*, III, 269–270. Tohill, pp. 58–59.

[34] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XV, 315, 457; XXV, 584–585.

[35] *W. H. Coll.*, X, 100.

primary object of your Exertions therefore", wrote the colonial secretary, "will be to open an intercourse with them." He saw but two ways of doing this: first, the destruction of the American fleet during the winter (or the building of a new flotilla); secondly, the establishment of a new route to Lake Huron from Toronto and the construction of a naval base at the mouth of the Severn River on an arm of Georgian Bay.[36]

The destruction of the American vessels on Lake Erie while the lake was frozen was by no means an impossibility. The British invasion of the Niagara frontier in December, 1813, endangered those at Erie. Plans were made in Canada for an expedition by water or over the ice to Put-in-Bay, where other ships were wintering. These plans were known or suspected on the American side, and created such alarm that General Harrison actually suggested burning the *Detroit* and *Queen Charlotte* to prevent their falling into the enemy's hands. Such extreme measures were not adopted, and the early breaking-up of the ice prevented the contemplated attack.[37] The naval control of Lake Erie was maintained by the United States, while British and Canadians turned to their alternative plan—the establishment of a route to Lake Huron by way of Toronto and Georgian Bay.

The need for such a route in war time, as a substitute for that generally employed, had been foreseen as early as the summer of 1811, when members of the North West Company were preparing to establish a portage from Yonge Street, running north from Toronto, to Matchedash on Nottawasaga Bay.[38] The plan was now taken up energetically by the British authorities. Prevost wrote Bathurst, February 8, 1814, that even before receiving his letter of December 3, he had prepared to send to Michilimackinac reënforcements, stores, provisions, and presents for the Indians by way of the old Ottawa River route and by Nottawasaga Bay. To the latter place he had sent shipwrights from Kingston to build gunboats for the conveyance of the troops and supplies, and because of the high importance of holding Michilimackinac, he had placed in command an able officer, Lieutenant Colonel Robert McDouall of the Glengarry Fencibles.[39]

[36] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XV, 448–451.

[37] Wood, III, 33–35, 39. Julius W. Pratt, *Expansionists of 1812* (New York, 1925), pp. 270–271.

[38] *John Askin Papers*, II, 688. Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, IX (1910), 88–89.

[39] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXV, 573. *Cf.* Douglas Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives, 1896* (Ottawa, 1897), State Papers, Lower Canada, p. 19. McDouall's name sometimes appears as McDonall. The establishment of the Nottawasaga River route and certain episodes related thereto are recounted by G. K. Mills, "The Nottawasaga River Route",

Decidedly overrating American energy, the British expected an attack upon Michilimackinac as early as the breakup of the ice permitted, and strained every nerve to be beforehand with their preparations. The ice broke early, and McDouall was forced to leave Nottawasaga Bay with only part of the bateaux he had counted upon, and leaving behind a portion of his supplies. With artillery, two companies of Royal Newfoundland infantry, ammunition, ordnance stores, and five months' provisions, he left the Nottawasaga River on April 25 and, making his way through waters littered with floating ice and torn by gales, reached Michilimackinac on May 18, with the loss of but one boat, the cargo of which was saved.[40] Quantitatively, it was a small achievement; yet it was a magnificent one, and in Prevost's mind fraught with tremendous consequences.

Prevost was thinking not simply of the campaign but of the terms of the peace that would one day be made, and he sought to impress Earl Bathurst with the vital importance of retaining permanent possession of Michilimackinac. The influence of that post, he wrote, was "felt among the Indian Tribes at New Orleans and the Pacific Ocean, vast Tracts of Country look to it for protection and supplies; and it gives security to the great Trading Establishments of the North West and Hudsons Bay Companies; by supporting the Indians on the Mississippi". These Indians, he explained, were the only barrier interposing between the fur companies and the Americans. Let that barrier be destroyed, and the ambitious Yankees would push north by the Red River into the heart of the fur country and execute "their long formed project of monopolizing the whole Fur Trade into their own hands".[41]

Michilimackinac was the key to the Indian country of the upper Mississippi Valley, and that, in turn, was the sole defense of the great fur companies against the enterprising Americans. Michilimackinac must therefore be held at all costs, and through it the Indian alliances be kept alive. How successfully McDouall held it, with his regulars, Canadian militia, and Dickson's Indians, against the tardy American attack on August 4, 1814, need not be related here.[42] Instead, we may well turn to study the activities of the dread antagonists who confronted the Indian tribes and their British allies far to the south, in the territories of Illinois and Missouri. The British held one door to the Indian country

Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, VIII (1907), 40–48, and E. Cruikshank, "An Episode of the War of 1812: the Story of the Schooner 'Nancy' ", *ibid.*, IX (1910), 75–126.

[40] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXV, 575–576, 583–585.

[41] *Ibid.*, XXV, 585.

[42] McDouall's account is printed in *ibid.*, XXV, 591–594.

at Michilimackinac; the Americans held the other on the Mississippi at St. Louis.

From the beginning to the end of the war, the Americans in Missouri and Illinois were thinking in terms of defensive strategy. Far from dreaming of the conquest of the Red River country and the preserves of the Hudson's Bay Company, they were wondering with what success they could defend their own frontiers and prevent the depopulation of their territories.

On receipt of the news of Hull's surrender at Detroit, Governor Howard wrote the Secretary of War that this disaster exposed the Missouri frontier "not only to injury but to total overthrow". There was not, he said, an American left at Prairie du Chien, where the Indians had taken possession of all American property. Dickson's influence there was thought to be supreme, and the gathering of armed bands, in reality intended for use in Upper Canada, was construed as designed against Missouri and Illinois. Even at St. Louis, Howard was alarmed at the attitude of the people; the French, and possibly others, were looking forward to a change of government. In the face of threats from without and doubtful loyalty within, he believed that nothing short of a full regiment of regular troops could render the country safe.[43]

We have seen that in the spring of 1812 a force of rangers had been embodied to protect the frontier against Indian attack. By midsummer or before Governors Howard and Edwards had several companies of rangers and volunteer cavalry in motion along the frontier from the Missouri River to Fort Mason, and on the Illinois side from that point to the head of the Kaskaskia River and at times as far east as the Wabash. Patrolling a line from one to three days' march in advance of the settlements, they gave a reasonable assurance of safety.[44] In August, Governor Edwards became convinced that Indians gathering at Peoria were plotting a formidable attack upon the frontier between the Mississippi and Kaskaskia rivers. He established a line of forts between these two rivers, from which minor attacks were repulsed, and in October took the offensive against the Indians' base at Peoria, where he burned a number of hostile villages and killed a few of their inhabitants, most of whom, however, escaped.[45]

Meanwhile, at Howard's behest, five companies of regulars were ordered to St. Louis, where they were to be commanded by Lieutenant

[43] Howard to Eustis, Sept. 20, 1812, MSS., War Dept.

[44] Edwards, pp. 313–314, 329. Howard to Eustis, Mar. 19, 1812, MSS., War Dept.

[45] Edwards, pp. 69–72. In January, 1812, Edwards had characterized Peoria as "the great highway through which all the Illinois Indians and all those about Lake Michigan make their incursions into this country". *Ibid.*, p. 295.

Colonel Daniel Bissell. Who was to direct military operations on this frontier is difficult to determine and probably was not clear to the War Department itself. Instructions of August 22, 1812, to Governor Howard and Lieutenant Colonel Bissell informed them that Brigadier General Harrison would command the troops in Indiana and Illinois territories. Howard was told that he was expected to aid and coöperate with Harrison; Bissell, that he was to receive Harrison's orders if it proved necessary that Harrison's command extend to St. Louis. Howard was instructed to "advise with" Bissell as to the disposition of the garrisons in the frontier forts. Governor Edwards was presently engaged in a controversy with Harrison over their relative rank and authority.[46] The tangle was not straightened out until the spring of 1813, when Howard, whose term as governor of Missouri (formerly Louisiana) Territory had expired, was appointed brigadier general in the United States Army, with command of the regulars, rangers, and militia of Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri territories. At the same time William Clark succeeded Howard as governor of Missouri Territory. It was not until October, 1813, however, that Howard was definitely told that his command was independent of Harrison's.[47]

The winter of 1812–1813 passed with only desultory brushes with the Indians, but with grave apprehension of impending danger. The gathering of British agents and Indians at Prairie du Chien created serious alarm. The British, Governor Howard believed, could easily bring artillery from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi, and could lead four Indians to St. Louis more readily than one to Malden. If they took St. Louis, all the Indians from the Mississippi to the Arkansas would join them. Governor Edwards estimated that there were some 1500 Indian warriors on the Illinois and its tributaries, besides numerous others between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi, all of whom could be readily used against Illinois Territory. He was no less alarmed than Howard over the British activities at Prairie du Chien. If the British should establish a fort there and maintain it for two years, he wrote, "this and Missouri Territory will be totally deserted—in other words, conquered".[48]

[46] War Dept. to Howard, Aug. 22, Oct. 7, 1812, Letter Book C, pp. 148, 151. War Dept. to Bissell, Aug. 22, 1812, Adjutant General's Office, Letters Sent, no. 2½, p. 63. Edwards, pp. 338–341.

[47] Sec. of State to Howard, Apr. 8, 1813, State Dept. MSS., Letters Sent, XVI, 213. Sec. of War to Howard, Apr. 10, Oct. 4, 1813, Military Book, VI, 359; VII, 52. Louisiana Territory became Missouri Territory in December, 1812.

[48] Howard to Armstrong, Jan. 10, Mar. 6, 1813, MSS., War Dept. Edwards, p. 347.

Although most of Dickson's warriors were led off to Upper Canada instead of down the Mississippi, other bands evaded the rangers and prowled about the settlements in Missouri and Illinois. Early in July, 1813, a company of Missouri rangers was defeated, with a number of casualties, by a Winnebago band. Governor Clark reported that numerous settlements had broken up, in both Illinois and Missouri, and that the route between St. Louis and Kentucky was unsafe for travel.[49]

In January, 1813, Governor Howard had advised a spring campaign with a force of 4000 men, one division to move from Kentucky through the Wabash country and one from St. Louis, the two to meet somewhere in Illinois, overawe the Indians, and establish permanent posts. Only in this way, he thought, could lasting safety be secured. A campaign on this scale was not sanctioned by the War Department, which had its troubles elsewhere. Washington could, in fact, do little to assist these remote frontiers. All its resources were needed for the campaigns in the north, and it was even necessary to send east regular units which had been stationed at Fort Massac and nearby.[50]

The question of what military posts to maintain or abandon and what new posts to establish had been left to the discretion of Colonel Bissell and the governor of Missouri Territory. Bissell reported in April, 1813, that he and Governor Howard had resolved to abandon Fort Osage, to maintain Fort Madison, to establish a post at Portage des Sioux, and to move Fort Mason down the Mississippi to Capais Grais, about twenty miles above the mouth of the Illinois. The maintenance of these few posts must have been seriously hampered by the withdrawal of regular troops. It proved impossible even to hold Fort Madison, which was evacuated during an Indian attack, September 3, 1813.[51]

New measures of defense were instituted in the summer and fall of 1813. Four strong, armed barges were constructed to patrol the Mississippi and Illinois rivers, and by July two of these were in service on the Mississippi above St. Louis.[52] In order to remove from British influence the Sauk, Fox, and Iowa Indians, most of whom still professed friendship for the United States, Clark arranged to transfer them from the Mississippi to the Missouri River, sending the women, children, and

[49] Clark to Armstrong, July 6, 1813, MSS., War Dept. *Cf.* Edwards, p. 346.

[50] Howard to Sec. of War, Jan. 10, 1813, MSS., War Dept. War Dept. to Howard, Feb. 11, 1813, Letter Book C, p. 155. War Dept. to Col. Bissell, Mar. 23, 1813, A. G. O., Letters Sent, no. 3, p. 151. Same to Howard, Apr. 23, 1813, *ibid.*, p. 181.

[51] Bissell to Armstrong, Apr. 12, 1813, MSS., War Dept. Bissell had been promoted to a colonelcy on August 15, 1812. Bissell to Cushing, Oct. 24, 1812, MSS., A. G. O., Letters Sent. J. Van der Zee, *op. cit.*, pp. 511–513.

[52] Clark to Armstrong, Feb. 24, July 6, 1813, MSS., War Dept.

old men around by boat, while the warriors with their horses traveled overland. Two Indian agents, Blondeau and Boilvin, were put in charge of the transfer, and the factory or trading post formerly at Fort Madison was reëstablished on the Missouri. "This measure", Clark reported, "will secure nearly 1000 warriors from joining the British party."[53] Finally, General Howard, collecting in September an army of about 1300 men—200 regulars and the remainder mounted rangers and militia —ascended the Illinois to the Indian villages on Peoria Lake. The villages were destroyed, the inhabitants, as usual, having fled to safety, and a strong fort, Fort Clark, was built at the outlet of the lake. "The safety of the frontier which was anticipated from this movement has been fully realized", Howard asserted.[54]

Another winter passed in comparative quiet. As dangers multiplied elsewhere, the government paid less and less attention to the frontier of Illinois and Missouri. General Howard was ordered to report to General Harrison at Cincinnati, and Governor Clark wrote in March, 1814, that all regular troops except part of one company of artillery were ordered away. The two territories had no defense save the handful of regulars, three companies of rangers, and such short-time volunteers as could be raised for service on the armed boats or elsewhere.[55]

If the government believed that the victories on Lake Erie and at the Thames rendered the farther frontier secure, its optimism was not shared by officers on the ground. Howard expressed open dissent from this view. Clark, with more specific information, reported that Robert Dickson had reached Prairie du Chien with five large boats laden with supplies, ammunition, and presents for the Indians, and was raising a large force which, though its destination was not known, was thought to be for use against Missouri Territory. In the event of such an attack, he said, the Mississippi would be undefended from its source to St. Louis.[56]

Dickson, meanwhile, though the force he was collecting was for the defense of Michilimackinac, was casting a covetous eye toward St. Louis, which, he believed, could be taken with 500 or 600 men. "It is unfortunate", he lamented, "that we are required in another Quarter we should find something worth fighting for there".[57]

[53] Clark to Armstrong, Sept. 12, 1813, *ibid.*

[54] Clark to Armstrong, Sept. 12, 1813; Howard to Armstrong, Oct. 28, 1813, *ibid.*

[55] War Dept. to Howard, Dec. 31, 1813, Military Book, VII, 89. Clark to Armstrong, Mar. 28, 1814, MSS., War Dept.

[56] Howard to Armstrong, Mar. 22, 1814; Clark to Armstrong, Mar. 28, 1814, *ibid.*

[57] *W. H. Coll.*, XI, 291.

To prevent such an incursion from up the river, Clark concluded that the best means was to take the offensive himself, and he recurred to the old project of dislodging the enemy from Prairie du Chien and thus severing the Indians from their British backers. This stroke, it will be recalled, had been considered even before the opening of the war; it had been postponed for lack of resources, but the thought of it had never been given up. The War Department had authorized General Howard to undertake it in the summer of 1813, but the authorization came too late to be used that season, even had the requisite men and supplies been at hand.[58] The completion of the flotilla of armed boats now seemed to render the plan feasible. The largest of these, Clark reported, was designed to carry one six-pound and one four-pound cannon and several howitzers, and afforded room for one hundred fighting men in addition to the oarsmen. These boats would give full security for the transportation of troops and supplies. With the boats and a few regular troops, Clark believed he would be able to take possession of the river to the falls of St. Anthony and to build and garrison a fort at Prairie du Chien. When the available force of regulars was, as previously noted, reduced to a mere handful, Clark modified his plans somewhat. In March he proposed to raise 150 men for two months' service on the boats and to send three of the boats up the river, one for patrol duty about the upper settlements, the other two to scour the river as high as Prairie du Chien and destroy such British magazines as they might find. The arrival of a company of sixty-one regulars under Major Zachary Taylor revived Clark's confidence in the possibility of establishing a post at Prairie du Chien, and on May 4 he wrote Armstrong that the expedition had set out and that he would presently join it and take command. He proposed to build a fort at Prairie du Chien and to leave there the company of regulars and one armed boat, and expected thus to "flustrate the plans of Mr. Dickson".[59]

Governor Clark paused on his way up the Mississippi to negotiate with hostile Sauk and Fox Indians at the mouth of Rock River. Overawed, perhaps, by the armed boats, they requested peace, which was granted on condition that they join with the United States and make war upon the Winnebago. On June 2 the expedition arrived at Prairie du Chien, which, practically undefended, was taken without opposition. A fort was built, which on June 20 was occupied by the regulars. Clark, meanwhile, returned to St. Louis, leaving the sixty regulars under Lieutenant Perkins in the fort, and a gunboat on the river manned by militiamen under Captain Yeizer. So confident was he of

[58] Armstrong to Howard, July 29, 1813, Military Book, VII, 26. Howard to Armstrong, Sept. 3, 1813, MSS., War Dept.

[59] Clark to Armstrong, Feb. 2, Mar. 28, May 4, 1814, *ibid.*

the permanence of his conquest, and of the impression made upon the Indians, that he recommended moving to Prairie du Chien the factory recently established on the Missouri, in order to supply the "friendly" Indians in that quarter.[60]

Clark's optimism was not wholly shared by General Howard, who in April had been ordered back to his old command at St. Louis and had arrived there a few days after the departure of Clark's expedition. Though he had been heartily in favor of the occupation of Prairie du Chien, he felt that the attempt to take and hold it with the small force then available was extremely risky. If Clark should take the place, he wrote on May 15, an immediate counterattack was to be expected, and it could not be securely held with less than four companies of regular troops. To hold a post 600 miles within the Indian country with only sixty-day militia to depend upon was utterly impracticable. Nor was Howard more hopeful after Clark's return. The War Department had sent no such reënforcements as he had requested. He had, however, sent some forty additional regulars and sixty-four rangers to reenforce the garrison at Prairie du Chien and relieve the militia there. While he was compelled to use rangers for this purpose and in escorting supplies to Fort Clark, the Indians were committing depredations from the Wabash to the Missouri. A large party from Rock River—of the very Indians whom Clark thought he had enlisted on the American side—had crossed to the Missouri and after failing to capture the factory there had attacked the settlements; and they had been joined by some of their kin whom Clark had transferred to the Missouri the preceding fall. The general had no high opinion of the value of treaties with the Indians, nor, it appears, of Governor Clark's statesmanship or generalship. He closed his letter with an appeal for instructions as to Prairie du Chien and for an adequate force if the place was to be held.[61]

Howard's questions were to be answered not by the Secretary of War but by the British and Canadians. Promptly upon receipt of information of the capture of Prairie du Chien, Lieutenant Colonel McDouall at Michilimackinac—although at the time expecting an attack on his own post—dispatched an expedition to retake it, for he believed it to be, after Michilimackinac, the key to the control of the upper Mississippi Valley and the fur country beyond. Major William McKay, a former member of the North West Company, was given command, with the temporary rank of lieutenant colonel. He took with him a

[60] Clark to Armstrong, June 5, June 28, 1814, *ibid.* *Cf. Niles' Register*, July 23, 1814, pp. 355–356.

[61] War Dept. to Howard, Apr. 6, 1814, Military Book, VII, 155. Howard to Armstrong, May 15, July 15, 1814, MSS., War Dept.

small cannon (which greatly impressed the Indians), a bombardier of the royal artillery, seventy-five Michigan Fencibles and Canadian volunteers, and 136 Indians. This force grew at Green Bay and elsewhere en route, so that upon arriving at Prairie du Chien on July 17, McKay had 120 whites and some 530 Indians; the latter, however, proving to be "perfectly useless". The small cannon was turned upon the American gunboat in the river, which soon cut its cable and disappeared down stream, leaving the troops in the fort to their fate. After holding out for three days, Perkins surrendered, receiving McKay's promise of protection from the Indians and respect for the private property of the garrison. The prisoners were held for ten days—McKay planned to use them as hostages if he was attacked—and finally paroled and sent to St. Louis under a guard which saw them safely past the hostile villages at Rock River.[62]

McKay had been instructed, if he found it practicable after taking Prairie du Chien, to descend the Mississippi, cross to Peoria, and attack the American fort at that place. Many of his Indians, however, went home after the fort had been taken, and he found his force too weak for the proposed expedition. He did, however, send off three Indians in a canoe with four kegs of powder, to assemble the Sauk Indians at Rock River, where he hoped they might intercept and possibly capture the gunboat, and it was probably due to this help and encouragement that the Indians were able to turn back the relief expedition which General Howard had dispatched up the river.[63]

The long expected clash of arms on the upper Mississippi had come at last, and the honors were all with the British and Canadians. They pressed their advantage as best they could with the slender resources at their command. McKay returned to Michilimackinac, leaving Captain T. G. Anderson in command at Fort McKay, as the new fort at Prairie du Chien was now called. Informed of the departure of a new American expedition from St. Louis, Anderson sent Lieutenant Duncan Graham, a former fur trader, with three small cannon, twenty white men, and numerous Indians, to Rock River, where he was to impede the progress of the American boats up the rapids. Graham was com-

[62] Lieutenant Joseph Perkins's report, Aug. [ ], 1814, enclosed in Howard to Sec. of War, Aug. 17, 1814, MSS., War Dept. McDouall to Drummond, July 16, 1814, *W. H. Coll.*, XI, 260–263. McKay to McDouall, July 27, 1814, *ibid.*, 263–270. The story of these and subsequent military events on the upper Mississipi is excellently told in Bruce E. Mahan, *Old Fort Crawford and the Frontier* (Iowa City, 1926), ch. 5.

[63] *W. H. Coll.*, XI, 267–270. Clark to Armstrong, July 31, 1814; Howard to Armstrong, Aug. 1, 1814, MSS., War Dept.

pletely successful. The Americans appeared on September 5, with eight large boats. Graham permitted them to anchor for the night unmolested below the rapids. Next morning he opened fire upon them with his three guns, and the Americans, after some random firing at the shore, retreated down stream, "their confusion being great at unexpectedly encountering a British Detachment on such a distant part of the Mississippi".[64] Until the end of the war, no American force passed this point. Thus the area of British control reached southward to the mouth of Rock River.

Even south of Rock River, the Americans had a desperately hard time defending their settlements from Indian attack. The British successes had been sufficient to determine the attitude of wavering tribes. British influence was now felt on the Missouri, where, as Howard reported in August, hostile Indians were "in considerable force . . . within the settlements", and waging a most destructive war.[65] An armed expedition under Colonel Henry Dodge was sent up the Missouri from St. Louis, and Clark sent Manuel Lisa among the friendly Missouri Indians to persuade them to make war upon the hostile tribes on the Mississippi.[66] On September 18, General Howard died at St. Louis. Colonel William Russell, who succeeded him as military commander, reported in October that military affairs in the district were in the utmost confusion. On the Mississippi there was no United States force north of a point just above the mouth of the Illinois. The militia of Illinois and Missouri had been discharged for want of clothing. Russell proposed to concentrate his few regulars and the armed boats on the Mississippi below the Illinois, and to station six companies of rangers, two on the Wabash, two on the Illinois at Fort Clark, and two on the Missouri above Boone's Lick, where they could annoy and break up the hunting camps of hostile Indians. By these means he hoped the frontier might be kept safe till spring; then, however, if the British maintained possession of the upper lakes, it would be easy for them to come to St. Louis or the Illinois frontier "with as many Indians as they can find".[67] New terrors now took possession of the American mind. It was rumored that Spain had declared war against

[64] *W. H. Coll.*, IX, 219–221, 226–228. *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXV, 600–601.

[65] Howard to Armstrong, Aug. 17, 1814; Clark to Armstrong, Aug. 20, 1814, MSS., War Dept.

[66] *W. H. Coll.*, IX, 244 and note. Tohill, pp. 71–72. *Cf.* Hiram Martin Chittenden, *American Fur Trade of the Far West* (3 vols., New York, 1902), III, 899–902. Clark to Armstrong, Aug. 20, Sept. 18, 1814, MSS., War Dept.

[67] Russell to Monroe, Oct. 20, 1814, MSS., War Dept.

the United States. Thomas Forsyth, formerly Indian agent at Peoria, thought it likely that spring would bring a joint attack, the Spaniards coming "down the Missouri by way of River Platte with a great body of Indians", while the British, with more Indians, would come by way of the Mississippi or Illinois, "by which means an indiscriminate massacre must take place".[68] It can be imagined that to a frontier in this state of weakness and apprehension, the news of peace would be more than welcome.

Each of the antagonists, it is plain, overrated the strength of the other. For while American officials in Missouri and Illinois were voicing their fears of a spring attack from the north and the southwest, the British commanders at Prairie du Chien and Michilimackinac were wondering whether they could even hold those posts against anticipated American attacks. The great difficulty with them was the obstruction of their communications with the east; for while the line by way of Toronto and Nottawasaga Bay had been kept open,[69] it could not compensate for the loss of Lake Erie and the Detroit River, and both Michilimackinac and Prairie du Chien were almost destitute of provisions for their garrisons and unable to furnish the Indians with the supplies and ammunition upon which, in the long run, their allegiance must depend. Captain Bulger, who took command at Fort McKay in December, 1814, found the settlement at Prairie du Chien so impoverished by the depredations of thieving Indians that it could not "support 20 men, much less than 60". Four hundred head of cattle had dwindled to less than ten, and, he added, "We have not at this moment an ounce of flour or meat in the store, nor have we the least prospect of getting any."[70] And Duncan Graham, in March, 1815, painted a gruesome picture of the famine and misery that prevailed among the Indians in that entire region—all, he thought, "owing to the shameful neglect on the part of the Government in not supplying the country better with ammunition in proper time". For the two

[68] *W. H. Coll.*, XI, 334–335. *Cf.* Edwards, p. 81. Captain Bulger, at Fort McKay, heard that "the Spaniards are certainly coming to St. Louis by way of the Missouri and that they are cussedly afraid at St. Louis". *W. H. Coll.*, XI, 313–314.

[69] The American expedition against Michilimackinac had burned the stores of the North West Company at St. Joseph and for a time had blockaded the mouth of the Nottawasaga River, where it had destroyed the schooner *Nancy*. Shortly thereafter, however, a British naval officer had captured the two American schooners left on blockade duty, thus reopening communications and gaining two vessels to replace the one lost. *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXV, 598, 603–604. There was always, of course, the alternative route by the Ottawa River.

[70] *W. H. Coll.*, XIII, 31–33.

thousand Indians who would presently assemble at the Prairie there was "not a pipe of tobacco, nor a shot of powder to give them. As for eating it is out of the question." Graham hoped that, as it was rumored down the river, the Americans would come again in the spring, and well supplied with provisions at that. "Should they overpower us, they will give us something to eat; otherwise should we be lucky enough to repel them, they will find it a difficult job to get off with their provisions, as I candidly think that the greatest coward in the country will be an Alexander or a Caesar to gain a piece of pork, or a bottle of whisky." [71]

McDouall, at Michilimackinac, could send Bulger little but admonitions to do his best and promises of better assistance in the spring. To McDouall it appeared of the utmost importance that Fort McKay should be held. The abandonment of that post, he wrote Bulger, would mean the irretrievable loss both of the country and of the allegiance of the Indians, who would then become "ferocious enemies, indignant at being abandoned, and leagued with the Americans, pouring down in swarms upon the province of Upper Canada". His efforts to maintain control on the Mississippi had, he said, "*invariably* far exceeded *my* instructions", yet he could not weaken his own defenses at Michilimackinac to aid Bulger, for Michilimackinac was the key to Prairie du Chien, and the Americans at Detroit were preparing for another blow at the island.[72] Help was expected from another quarter. In early March, 1815, neither the signing of the peace treaty nor the fate of the British expedition at New Orleans was known at Michilimackinac, and McDouall was writing to his subordinates at Fort McKay and Green Bay that combined British and Spanish operations were in progress on the lower Mississippi and from Santa Fe which made it necessary only for the British in the north to hold their ground in order to achieve "important results".[73]

Despite the failure of supplies and ammunition, most of the Indians maintained their allegiance to their British masters. Those who had depended upon the Americans had fared no better, and British agents were careful to inform the tribes that the British commissioners at Ghent were laboring in their interest. The Indians at Michilimackinac were, according to McDouall, "all staunch"; and Duncan Graham,

[71] *Ibid.*, X, 127–132. [72] *Ibid.*, XIII, 101–105, 118–122.

[73] *Ibid.*, X, 123–124; XIII, 104; *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXIII, 503. On March 19, McDouall informed Bulger of American reports of the victory at New Orleans and of the arrival from Montreal of the first news of peace. *W. H. Coll.*, XIII, 120.

who visited the Rock River villages in February, found Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, and Iowa collecting there, all hostile to the Americans, and learned that all the Indians on the lower Missouri were plotting "to strike on the Americans this Spring".[74] British influence was still supreme as far south as Rock River, and the American officer who went up the Mississippi with news of peace at the end of March found tangible evidence of that fact in the presence there of this same Duncan Graham, to whom he conveyed his dispatches for the commander at Fort McKay.[75]

Had the terms of peace been determined by achievements in the local theater, the Wisconsin country and the entire Mississippi Valley north of Rock River must have gone to the British, for they, with the assistance of fur traders and Indians, had unquestionably won and held that entire area. Their brave and energetic work had been done consciously, purposely, with this end in view. This is clear from what has previously been said of McDouall's attitude. McDouall well knew that he had conquered the Northwest; he was determined to hold it until a peace treaty should assign it to Great Britain or to the Indians.

Less clearly, American officers in the western country perceived the threat of conquest in the British activity there, but they were unable, apparently, to arouse Washington to the danger. There is no indication that Washington officials were thinking of aught beyond preserving the safety of this frontier against Indian attack. American attention was centered upon the St. Lawrence and the Lakes, and no doubt wisely so; for, as it turned out, the fate of the West was dependent upon the outcome of the war in the East. Wisconsin and the Mississippi Valley were saved, not at St. Louis, but on Lake Erie, the Niagara frontier, and Lake Champlain, at Ghent, and even at the far distant Congress of Vienna.

How the British government regarded the war on the upper Mississippi is less easy to tell. It has recently been suggested that the operations there and the New Orleans campaign were parts of one plan of strategy, that there existed "an extensive and coördinated plan to subjugate the entire Mississippi Valley".[76] It has been seen that McDouall expected the New Orleans operations to contribute to his success in the

[74] *W. H. Coll.*, X, 127, 128; XIII, 119. *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXIII, 459–461.

[75] Major Taylor Berry to Col. Russell, Apr. 22, 1815, inclosed in Russell to Sec. of War, May 15, 1815, MSS., War Dept.

[76] Robert L. Fisher, "The Treaties of Portage des Sioux", *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, XIX, 495–508.

north. It is also true that General Drummond, early in 1815, contemplated launching an Indian attack against St. Louis, presumably by way of Michilimackinac and Prairie du Chien—an idea which McDouall declared was suggested by a knowledge of the operations at New Orleans.[77] According to the same authority, however, Drummond's chief purpose in proposing this plan was to rid himself of Indian allies whom he could not conveniently feed on the Niagara frontier. No evidence has been adduced to show that the British government in any way connected the New Orleans campaign with operations on the upper reaches of the Mississippi. Acquisition of Louisiana by Great Britain was not contemplated; at best, the territory might be restored to Spain or encouraged to seek an independent existence.[78] In the north, as we have seen, both Prevost and Bathurst attached much importance to the possession of Michilimackinac but apparently they did not share McDouall's keen interest in Prairie du Chien, for McDouall had written Bulger that what he had done for that post invariably far exceeded his instructions. Indeed, it seems doubtful whether the authorities at Downing Street had any notion that they had conquered or were likely to conquer the upper Mississippi Valley, for their envoys at Ghent, after first demanding revision of the line from Lake Superior to the Mississippi, quickly agreed to let the old line from Lake Superior to the Lake of the Woods stand as before. It is especially significant that they agreed to this line at the same time that they were insisting upon holding Michilimackinac and Fort Niagara on the principle of *uti possidetis*. If the British had a plan to subjugate the entire Mississippi Valley, there is no hint of it in the Ghent negotiations.[79]

That Great Britain asked for so little was not due to lack of pressure from the interested fur companies. In May, 1814, Messrs. Inglis, Ellice, and Company of London submitted to Lord Bathurst a long memorial on the history, condition, and needs of the fur trade, in which they proposed a number of possible boundaries between Canada and the United States. The most modest of these would have secured for Canada nearly all of Michigan and the vast territory west of the Wa-

[77] *W. H. Coll.*, XIII, 121–122.

[78] Henry Adams, *History of the United States*, VIII, 312–314, citing instructions to General Ross. *Cf.* J. F. Rippy, *Rivalry of the United States and Great Britain over Latin America, 1808–1830* (Baltimore, 1929), pp. 45–48.

[79] *A. S. P., Foreign Relations*, III, 709, 715, 725. *Cf. Correspondence, Despatches, . . . of Viscount Castlereagh*, edited by Charles William Vane, Marquess of Londonderry (12 vols., London, 1848–1853), X, 169.

bash and north of the Ohio and Missouri rivers. If the United States could not be induced to cede all this territory to Great Britain, the memorialists proposed that it should at least be made a permanent Indian reservation.[80] A partial acceptance of these suggestions is seen in certain of the original demands of the British commissioners at Ghent; namely, revision of the boundary from Lake Superior to the Mississippi and the restoration of the line of Wayne's treaty as a permanent Indian boundary. These demands, however, and indeed the entire interests of the fur companies, were soon abandoned. As finally drawn, the treaty restored all conquered territory and assured to the Indians still at war with the United States merely a restoration of the status of 1811. Even rights of access to and navigation of the Mississippi, which the American commissioners had been willing to grant conditionally,[81] were omitted from the treaty. For the fur companies, which had expected so much from the war, and for the Indian allies to whom so much had been promised, the treaty to Ghent was an abject surrender by the British government.

That the fur companies or the officers who had conquered Michilimackinac and Prairie du Chien should accept such a settlement good-humoredly was not to be expected. McDouall's impression of the first unauthenticated report of the peace was that the terms were "repugnant to sound policy, & not only prejudicial to our Indian connexion but endangering not a little, the future interests and safety of the Canadas". Later, when he knew the worst, he remarked to his friend Bulger: "Our Negociators as usual have been egregiously duped: As usual, they have shown themselves profoundly ignorant of the concerns of this part of the Empire." [82]

On March 28, 1815, General Drummond, Prevost's successor, sent orders to McDouall for the restoration of Michilimackinac to the United States as soon as the garrison and stores could be removed to a new post, which was to be selected. Prairie du Chien was also to be turned over to the United States without loss of time.[83] Certain gentlemen of the North West Company, however, urged upon General Drummond the view that Michilimackinac might be considered an island in dispute between Great Britain and the United States under Article VI of the treaty, and that it should therefore be evacuated only

[80] Davidson, appendix N, pp. 296–301.
[81] *A. S. P., For. Rel.*, III, 738, 742, 745.
[82] *W. H. Coll.*, XIII, 120. *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXIII, 513.
[83] *Ibid.*, XXV, 621–622.

upon condition that the United States should not take possession until ownership had been determined by a commission.[84] Drummond, while not convinced by this argument, was anxious to assist the traders, and therefore sent orders to McDouall to find excuses for delaying the surrender until definite instructions could be received from England. A few days later, however, these orders were countermanded. The United States government had protested against the delay and had made known its intention not to surrender Malden except in exchange for Michilimackinac. Drummond, therefore, fearing that delay might "excite feelings unfavourable to the established honour of the British Nation", sent orders to McDouall on May 4, 1815, to expedite his withdrawal as much as possible. On July 18, 1815, having previously removed guns, provisions, and stores to St. Joseph and Manitoulin Island, McDouall turned over Michilimackinac to Colonel Butler of the United States Army.[85]

Captain Bulger and his command had abandoned and burned Fort McKay some eight weeks previously. In a letter of April 25, McDouall had informed Bulger of the news of peace, instructed him to dissuade the Indians from any further act of hostility, and warned him to be ready to withdraw his garrison. On May 1, having received Drummond's orders of March 28 for the evacuation of Michilimackinac and Prairie du Chien, McDouall instructed his subordinate to take immediate steps to surrender Fort McKay to the Americans, bringing away all public stores, but restoring the captured guns with the fort. A further communication, dated May 5, however, raised the question whether Prairie du Chien, being in the heart of the Indian country, and not having been in American possession in 1811, ought, under the terms of the treaty, to be turned over to troops of the United States. Although Drummond's orders had been plain, McDouall assumed that they might have originated in a mistaken interpretation of the treaty. Accordingly, he authorized Bulger, if the United States should not insist on actual restoration of the fort, to destroy it, sending the guns down the river to St. Louis or bringing them to Michilimackinac, as might prove more convenient. If, moreover, he was convinced that a transfer from the British to an American garrison would be likely

[84] John Richardson and Wm. McGillivray to Drummond, Apr. 20, 1815, *ibid.*, XVI, 77–80. As the treaty said expressly that all territory taken by one belligerent from the other during the war was to be returned, this interpretation seems utterly without basis.

[85] *Ibid.*, XVI, 80–81, 177; XXV, 625, 626, 627–629.

to embroil either with the Indians, he was likewise to abandon and destroy the fort.[86]

Bulger's account of the evacuation and destruction of Fort McKay presents a puzzle in chronology. In his report to McDouall, dated at Michilimackinac on June 19, he mentioned receipt of McDouall's letter of April 25, but justified his evacuation of the post on the ground of the danger besetting his garrison from the disaffected Indians, and spoke of the act as unauthorized. He stated, further, that he received McDouall's letters of May 1 and 5 on May 25, the day after his departure from Prairie du Chien. Yet in a letter to Governor Clark, dated at Fort McKay, May 23, the day before his departure, he referred to McDouall's instructions of May 5 as justification for his course and inclosed a copy of the portion of those instructions authorizing him, under certain conditions, to destroy the fort and withdraw the garrison.[87]

On the day after leaving Prairie du Chien, Bulger met two bateaux forwarded by McDouall from Michilimackinac, laden with supplies and presents for the Indians—pork, flour, cloth, tobacco, iron, guns, powder, shot, and ball. These he distributed to the Sauk and other tribes about Prairie du Chien, who, as he reported, had been left "above want" and in a situation more comfortable than in former years.[88] Probably this was the last such distribution by British agents that ever took place in that region. Thereafter, Indians of the Mississippi desiring a continuance of British largess must seek it at Drummond Island, the new British post on Lake Huron. No longer would British supplies come to them by way of Michilimackinac, Green Bay, and Prairie du Chien.[89] British domination of the upper Mississippi Valley was ended forever.

JULIUS W. PRATT.

The University of Buffalo.

[86] *Ibid.*, XVI, 89–91; XXIII, 507–508, 508–512.

[87] *Ibid.*, XXIII, 515–517. Bulger to Clark, May 23, 1815, inclosed in Clark to Dallas, June 19, 1815, MSS., War Dept. It is possible that Bulger had not sent off his letter to Governor Clark until after he received McDouall's instructions of May 5, authorizing him to do what he had already done, and that he then rewrote the letter without changing the date.

[88] *M. P. H. Coll.*, XXIII, 510, 516.

[89] The situation is here explained in a letter from McDouall to Sir F. P. Robinson, Jan. 10, 1816. *Ibid.*, pp. 96–97. *Cf.* Van der Zee, *op. cit.*, p. 517. By Act of Congress, April 29, 1816, the right to trade with the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States was restricted to citizens thereof, except as the President should direct otherwise. *Annals of Cong.*, 14 Cong., 1 sess., cols. 1901–1903.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

A Note on the Negotiations for the Peace of Utrecht

It has long been known that the negotiations which led to what Professor G. M. Trevelyan has recently called "the difficult and indispensable Peace of Utrecht" were conducted on the English side by ministers whose personal aims were not always at one.[1] The consequences of these divisions inside the Oxford ministry have been very thoroughly explored in so far as they affected domestic matters, and it has been found possible to define with tolerable accuracy the relative shares of Oxford and of St. John in the formulation of policy. With regard to foreign policy, however, it is curious that in spite of St. John's own statement that there were divisions on this matter as on others,[2] both St. John's biographers and the historians of the period in general have all concurred in treating the peace negotiation of 1711–1713 as having been exclusively in St. John's hands. Mahon declared in his magisterial way that "It is on St. John that the shame of the inglorious treaty of Utrecht should mainly rest. He directed all its steps from London". Lecky's verdict was similar though less unfavorably expressed.[3] Mr. F. S. Oliver, in a recent work whose object is to marry history to politics, is of the same opinion.[4] The last considerable biographer of St. John, Sichel, discredited Oxford's claim to have originated any part of the negotiation, and after describing Oxford as "incapable of navigating shoals so tortuous", complained of his arrogating to himself "the

[1] Since this article was written, the last volume of Professor Trevelyan's *England under Queen Anne* has appeared. While for the first time drawing adequate attention to the fact that the peace negotiations were initiated through Jersey and only passed into St. John's hands after April, 1711, Professor Trevelyan, like his predecessors, lets it be understood that they remained exclusively in those hands from that date forward. See pp. 179–180, 209, 215.

[2] In the *Letter to Sir William Windham* (London, 1753).

[3] Lord Mahon, *History of England from the Peace of Utrecht* (London, 1858), I, 29. William Edward Hartpole Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1911), I, 117.

[4] *The Endless Adventure* (London, 1930), I, 146. "The carrying out, if not the conception, of this treaty was the work of Bolingbroke. . . . Execrated from first to last by the Opposition, often unaided and at times obstructed by his fellow-ministers, he urged forward and guided the negotiation with the whole force of his indefatigable spirit. The credit of the achievement was his. . . ."

whole glory of the negotiations which Bolingbroke had notoriously alone conducted". The earlier "Lives" of St. John by MacKnight and Cooke, and Hassall's later but slighter study, were all, in their varying degrees, at one in treating the whole negotiation as entirely and solely St. John's work.[5]

While it is obviously true that the vast bulk of the ostensible negotiations was in St. John's hands, it seems probable that Oxford was not so negligible a factor in them as has been assumed. The Whig Committee of Secrecy of 1715 which inquired into the conduct of the negotiations, was anxious to inculpate Oxford no less than St. John, and it was natural, therefore, that it should have adopted Oxford's own view that his intervention had often been decisive. On the other hand, there are many stray indications scattered throughout St. John's printed work which might have suggested that in foreign, as well as in domestic, affairs he had to reckon with the older man's interference. In his *Letters on the Study and Use of History*[6] he remarked that Oxford "had his correspondencies apart, and a private thread of negotiation always in his hands". In the *Letter to Sir William Windham* he had complained that by reason of Oxford's credit with the queen and rank in the state "his concurrence was necessary to every thing we did", and that Oxford's interference was harmful because he "negotiated indeed by fits and starts, by little tools and indirect ways". The extract here printed from a letter of the Abbé Gaultier to Torcy, secretary of state to Louis XIV, is of interest as revealing Oxford's wish to maintain "a correspondence apart" with Torcy and to maintain it unknown to St. John. The letter is dated January 27, 1712, N.S., and was written when Gaultier, having acted as intermediary between the English and French courts throughout all the preliminary negotiations of 1711, was expecting to leave London for the Congress of Utrecht which was then about to open.

Mr. Prior n'est encore pourveu d'aucune charge, le grand Tresorier qui ne scauroit se passer de luy, a des raisons particuliers qui l'empechent de le placer comme il merita parceque s'il etoit en employ, ce Seigneur ne pourroit

[5] Walter Sichel, *Bolingbroke and his Times* (London, 1901), I, 316, 400, 487. Thomas MacKnight, *Life of Henry St. John* (London, 1863), pp. 203 and 207–208; "It was St. John who conducted the secret negotiations, and held in his hands the great issues of peace or war. . . ." George Wingrove Cooke, *Memoirs of Lord Bolingbroke* (London, 1835). Cooke says that "All the negotiations which followed were entirely the work of St. John" (I, 147). Of the peace he states that St. John was "the man who singly undertook and accomplished it" (p. 234), and he specifically denies the claim of Oxford to have had any considerable part in the negotiation (pp. 267–268). Arthur Hassall, *Life of Viscount Bolingbroke* (Oxford, 1915), ch. III.

[6] Letter VIII (London, 1752).

pas si aisement se servir de luy comme il fait en toutes sortes d'occasions pour aller d'un costé et d'un autre pour les affaires secretes de la cour . . . .

Lorsque je seray a Utrecht et que Votre Excellence aura quelque chose a faire scavoir icy, Elle aura la bonté de s'addresser directement a monsieur de St. Jean . . . comme elle a fait jusqu'a present . . . mais quand vous voudrez ecrire a notre grand Tresorier en particulier, je vous supplie de m'envoier vos lettres a Utrecht, je les donneray a Mr. Prior qui aura soin de les faire passer icy de la maniere qu'il en conviendra avec le Tresorier qui me charge absolument de vous dire de sa part qu'il ne veut pas pour plusieurs raisons, apres que je seray parti, se confier ny s'ouvrir a qui que ce soit pas meme a M. de St. Jean lorsqu'il sera question de nous ecrire et de recevoir de vos lettres.[7]

It is probable that Oxford's wish to exclude St. John from the final direction of the negotiation with France was due, not to any divergence of policy between the two men, but to what Swift called Oxford's "reserved, mysterious way of acting" and his "want of dividing a due proportion of business among others". From the time of the formation of the government, Oxford had begrudged any real share of authority to the younger man. It is common knowledge that he and the queen had carried through the changes of 1710 with the intention of proceeding "upon a moderating scheme in order to reconcile both parties",[8] and if we may believe Carte, had Oxford been able to win over such Whigs as Cowper and Walpole, Harcourt and St. John would have had to be content with the subordinate posts which they had held prior to 1708.[9] In July, 1711, Gaultier had told Torcy that Oxford had originally had no intention of admitting St. John to the peace negotiation, but that the latter had succeeded in introducing himself during Oxford's indisposition after the Guiscard incident and that, once admitted, he could not be easily ignored.[10] In confirmation of this view it may be pointed out that although Swift regarded Oxford, Harcourt, and St. John as the triumvirate upon whose union the government depended, and although throughout his correspondence in 1711 St. John always mentions Shrewsbury, Oxford, Rochester, and, in a lesser degree, Harcourt, as the colleagues who had been consulted upon foreign affairs, the whole tenor

[7] Archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères, Correspondance politique, Angleterre, vol. 237, ff. 29–30.

[8] Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the Duke of Portland*, vols. II and IV, *passim*.

[9] Carte MSS. in the Bodleian Library, vol. 231, f. 34. Color is lent to Carte's belief that Harcourt and St. John had to threaten to break off in 1710 in order to obtain their respective offices of lord keeper and secretary of state, by a letter of St. John to Oxford on March 8, 1710, in which he professes himself "indifferent what employment is reserved for me", but says that he looks for something better than resuming his old post of secretary of war (*Portland* MSS., IV, 536).

[10] Printed in the *English Historical Review*, XXIX (1914), 526.

of Shrewsbury's letters to Oxford of that year suggests that these two formed an inner conciliabulum whose business was not fully communicated to St. John. A reading of this correspondence leaves a strong impression that Oxford had a far greater share in determining the foreign policy of his administration than has been believed, and that it is by no means certain but that the same judgment may be found to apply to Shrewsbury.[11] The wish which Oxford now expressed for a direct correspondence between himself and Torcy was evidently carried out, for on April 29, 1712, St. John himself wrote to Strafford in terms which indicate that the crucial negotiation as to the separation of the French and Spanish crowns was in the last resort in Oxford's hands.[12] It would appear to be certain also that the decision to send the famous Restraining Orders of May, 1712, to Ormonde forbidding him to engage the British forces in any siege or battle until he had received further instructions, was taken by Oxford without prior consultation of any kind with St. John.[13]

It is conceivable that Oxford's wish to preserve an entirely personal correspondence with Torcy was due to a desire to conceal from St. John the plans with which he had been amusing the Jacobites in France since December, 1710, plans in which there is no sign of St. John's participation before October, 1712, but even without this supposition the letter here printed is sufficiently explicable by Oxford's habit of engrossing all authority in himself. In view of this habit, there was some disingenuity in Oxford's later complaint that "during this whole Negotiation, the Treasurer was obliged by his own Hand, and his own charge, to correspond in all the Courts concerned in the Negotiation. . . ."[14]

Finally, it may be pointed out that the extract here printed points to a close connection between Oxford and Prior. With regard to what

[11] Hist. MSS. Com., *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath*, I, 201–202, 215. All the letters in this volume referring to the year 1711 suggest that Oxford was monopolizing the queen's confidence. In April, 1711, when St. John was first ordered to communicate the French offers to the Dutch through Raby, Shrewsbury and Oxford were arranging for Vanhulst to carry their private views on these overtures to the Pensionary Heinsius.

[12] Gilbert Parke, ed., *Letters and Correspondence of Bolingbroke* (London, 1798), II, 299–300. ". . . by several expressions which dropped from him [Oxford] . . . I could plainly find, that he knew what would be most, and what least agreeable at Versailles. . . . What I say concerning the Treasurer's part in this matter is only founded upon conjecture, for . . . I am not in this part of his secret . . . ."

[13] Philip Yorke, 2d earl of Hardwicke, ed., *Miscellaneous State Papers* (London, 1778), II, 482. *Letters on the Study and Use of History*, Letter VIII.

[14] A brief Account of publick Affairs, printed in A Report from the Committee of Secrecy, 1715, *Reports from Committees of the House of Commons*, I, 40.

Gaultier here writes of Prior, it is possible that this story of Oxford's need of him was concocted to conceal the fact that the queen had objected to Prior's being sent to Utrecht on account of his "meane extraction".[15] On the other hand, there are signs that Prior, to whom so large a part of the direct Anglo-French negotiation in Paris was entrusted, was in fact Oxford's particular dependent. Thus, when it was originally intended that the Preliminaries of October, 1711, should be signed by "all those who have the honor to sit in your Majesty's Cabinet Council", it was at Oxford's suggestion that Prior's name was added to the list.[16] The belief common to the biographers of St. John that he and Prior were peculiar allies is probably due to the fact that St. John was always more familiar than Oxford with those who worked with him, and always much more easy of access, and that in consequence his correspondence with Prior has something of the bonhomie of one boon companion writing to another. Unfortunately, while preserving the instructions which he received from St. John, Prior destroyed the letters which he received from Oxford.[17] It is significant, however, that Addison, in his account of the proceedings taken against Prior by the Secret Committee in June, 1715, gave it as his opinion that the evidence showed that Prior was "rather a creature of Harley, than of Bolingbroke".[18]

H. N. Fieldhouse.

The University of Manitoba.

The Mississippi Boundary of 1763: a Reappraisal of Responsibility

Perhaps one of the most significant facts in Western history between 1763 and 1803 is the drawing of the Mississippi boundary in the Peace of Paris in such a way as to leave New Orleans and the control of the river's outlet to the power possessing the trans-Mississippi. The boundary of 1763 drawn by the Iberville River was impossible of navigation, and without the right of deposit the navigation of the main channel, accorded by the treaty, was indeed illusory. Spanish control of the mouth of the Mississippi spelled the ruin of British dreams of exploiting the Illinois; after 1783 it produced turmoil, confusion, and sedition in the young American West until the Louisiana Purchase restored the unity of the great valley.

[15] *Bath MSS.*, I, 217.

[16] Parke, *Correspondence*, I, 369–370.

[17] Adrian Drift, ed., *History of His Own Time from the Manuscripts of Matthew Prior* (London, 1740), pp. 421–422.

[18] Public Record Office, State Papers, Domestic, George I, vol. III, f. 55.

It is therefore surprising that the way in which the boundary came to be drawn in that fashion has never been clearly set forth. Part at least of the story is told in the Viry-Solar papers now in the Clements Library at Ann Arbor. Those papers, in some way or other copied for the Earl of Shelburne from such originals as survived in the hands of the Comte de Viry, present in their very existence a fascinating problem.[1] Incidentally they throw considerable light on their most interesting source, the Comte de Viry, Sardinian minister in London, trusted and intimate adviser at once of Pitt, Bute, and Newcastle, political go-between among those suspicious politicians and, most important for our present purpose, maker of the Peace of Paris.[2] The Sardinian envoys at St. James's and Versailles were of course the channel through which the negotiation of 1762 between France and England was begun. Viry used his footing of trust with Bute to play the part of a not too honest broker in getting France as favorable a peace as possible. Especially was he instrumental in getting the Mississippi boundary marked by the Iberville River and Lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain to the sea.

A succession of scholars who have used the Viry-Solar correspondence, missing the significance of a letter or two, have ascribed that boundary to sharp practice on the part of the Duc de Choiseul.[3] There is no moral responsibility on any historical student to whiten Choiseul's reputation. His learned and capable French defender M. Waddington was able to leave him no better character than that of a very honest diplomat but something given to lying, as a diplomat should not do except in the way of honesty. However the most unmoral historical student is concerned with the exactitude of fact; and exact fact requires the transfer of responsibility for the Mississippi boundary of 1762–1763 from the shoulders of Choiseul to those of the Earl of Bute.

We may pick up the story of the peace negotiation at the end of April, 1762. The results of a cabinet meeting held on April 23 were formulated into a draft on April 24 or 25 by the Earl of Egremont, secre-

[1] The surviving papers are only a part of those that served in the negotiation. The most secret were returned to the senders uncopied, or were destroyed. I originally used a transcript of these papers in the Canadian archives at Ottawa; to that institution and to the Clements Library my acknowledgments are due for their use.

[2] For an interesting characterization of Viry, see L. B. Namier, *England in the Age of the American Revolution* (London, 1930), pp. 91–93. My colleague Dr. Lucille Shay has undertaken a much-needed biography of the Comte de Viry.

[3] Sir Julian S. Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War* (London, 1907), II, 333–350. Arthur S. Aiton, "The Diplomacy of the Louisiana Cession", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI, 715. E. Wilson Lyon, *Louisiana in French Diplomacy* (Norman, 1934), p. 24, does not utilize the correspondence but follows Aiton.

tary of state for the southern department.[4] It suggested a division of the Neutral Islands, and demanded either Louisiana or Guadeloupe as an equivalent for the return of Martinique. On the pretext that some of the lords had refrained from stating their opinions a second meeting was summoned for April 30.[5] At this meeting Bute declared the French would never give up Guadeloupe or Louisiana for Martinique; to fix on something to which England might adhere, he proposed retaining the Neutral Islands and Grenada, and demanding the Mississippi River as boundary.[6] "It appear'd", wrote Hardwicke, "by what Lord Egremont said, that His Lordship had had his difficulties and misgivings upon the new proposition of the part of Louisiana on the left side of the Mississippi; and that the noble Lord, who made it, had not *Then* consider'd how it was mix'd and complicated with certain Spanish settlements."[7] The decision was incorporated in a letter addressed by Egremont to Viry on May 1 for transmission to the Comte de Choiseul. It demanded "that the course of the Mississippi river be for the future the boundary between the two nations",[8] and here we may let the Comte de Viry take up the story.

•

When My Lord Egremont gave me his letters for M. le Comte de Choiseul, and the one he had written me, I told him quite naturally, that I did not well understand what he wished to tell me in his letter, when he asked that the course of the Mississippi River be for the future the boundary of the two nations in the American continent; as he answered, after a sufficiently lengthy discourse on the matter, which gave me no enlightenment, that the question I put to him was so delicate he could not give me a reply, inasmuch as his letter had been read in council without any one's finding the expressions could give rise to doubt, I took my resolution: since I was well convinced that My Lord Egremont would not serve to explain matters, that it would be more to the point to write confidentially to a person of credit asking him to tell me what was meant by these expressions; and I received in reply the note a copy of which I annex.[9]

Copy of the note on the subject of the boundary of the course of the Mississippi between the two nations.

[4] Lord Egremont's Answer to the Duc de Choiseul's Points, British Museum, Additional MSS., 32937, f. 341. See on this Newcastle to Hardwicke, Nov. 27, 1762; Hardwicke to Newcastle, Nov. 28, 1762, *ibid.*, 32945, ff. 159, 176.

[5] Egremont to Newcastle, Apr. 29, 1762, *ibid.*, 32937, ff. 423–424.

[6] Bute to Bedford, May 1, 1762, *Correspondence of John [Russell], Fourth Duke of Bedford*, Lord John Russell, ed. (London, 1846), III, 75–76.

[7] Hardwicke to Newcastle, May 1, 1762, B. M., Add. MSS., 32938, f. 10.

[8] Viry-Solar Correspondence, Shelburne Papers, IX, 174–175, Clements Library.

[9] Viry to Solar, May 4, 1762, *ibid.*, pp. 182–183. The channel of communication with the "person of credit", as it appears below, was Sir James Stuart Mackenzie, Bute's brother, who took an active part in the negotiation.

> The line of the boundary of Canada to the west, traced by M. de Vaudreuil [10] ends at the junction of the Ohio with the Mississippi. From that junction to the sea the course of the Mississippi shall serve as boundary between the two nations; but as the Mississippi has several outlets, that one is meant which is farthest to the east; that is to say that which passes by the little River Iberville, Lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain and thence reaches the sea.[11]

The secret of this concession for some time was known only to Bute.

In his proposals of May 29 Choiseul apparently conceded the angle of territory between Red Lake and the Wabash by according the Mississippi River boundary from its source to the Ohio.[12] The real difficulty, however, was nearer the gulf where Spain whose concurrence in the peace terms was necessary insisted the English could never be allowed. Proposals to this effect were dispatched from France, June 28, cast in the form of articles. In them the Mississippi boundary in deference to Spanish protests was reworded: "France will allow the fixation of the boundaries of Canada with the greatest latitude, provided they do not cross the Mississippi River and do not encroach along the sea on the dependencies of Louisiana. These boundaries will be marked on a map annexed to the Preliminaries." [13] Choiseul privately assured Solar that they still held to their former offer! [14] The map was dispatched on July 5, with expressions of surprise that Egremont, not in the secret of Bute's note, continued to press for the Mississippi boundary by the main channel to the Gulf.[15]

The reader may judge for himself as to the reason for the mistake in the map, which is mentioned in the following letter from Viry to Solar, July 12:

[10] The allusion is to a map transmitted by Sir Jeffrey Amherst with the boundary of Canada allegedly marked by the Marquis de Vaudreuil at the capitulation of Montreal in September, 1760. Actually it seems to have been marked by Major Frederick Haldimand, as he assumed, with Vaudreuil's assent. The line ran from Red Lake southeasterly to the sources of the Illinois, thence to those of the Wabash and down its right bank to the Ohio, and to the Mississippi. Amherst to Haldimand, Nov. 1, 1762; Haldimand to Amherst, Dec. 10, 1762, B. M., Add. MSS., 21661, ff. 244, 257. Vaudreuil to Duc de Choiseul [?], Oct. 30, 1761, Article à mettre dans le Gazette de France, Archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères, Correspondance politique, Mémoires et documents amériques, vol. 21, ff. 96–101vo.

[11] Shelburne Papers, IX, 183.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 272–273. Below the mouth of the Ohio he proposed that the line run a league to the east of the left bank.

[13] *Ibid.*, X, 113.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 134–135.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 219.

I had next morning [July 8] a long conference with My Lord Bute, that I began by trying to engage his consent to cede Dominica to France; but seeing that would be to turn affairs backward, rather than gain anything on the point, I decided to read him all Your Excellency sent me and show him the map you had sent. I assure you M. that he was surprized at the article which concerns the Mississippi, after M. le Duc de Choiseul had indicated in his memoir of May 29 last, that the boundary between the nations should begin at the source of the river. Of that memoir the council were fully aware as Your Excellency may take note, from what I had the honor to write by my dispatch to Calais the 28th of last month, which indicated that the English ministry might offer St. Lucia to France according to the very confidential letter I had the honor to write Your Excellency on this subject. Only My Lord Bute of the English ministers knew the note I sent Your Excellency confidentially May 4 last touching the Mississippi, and only he and My Lord Egremont were aware of my letter to Your Excellency on St. Lucia the 28th of last month as is sufficiently apparent from my letters. I must not omit here to tell Your Excellency that My Lord Bute also said to me in this conversation after having examined the map, that the note I had sent had been made on the map of Louisiana by D'Anville, further observing to me with an air that was a little vexed, that the yellow line of the map you sent me, Monsieur, indicating the English possessions, did not go to the sea, or pass Pearl River, although by the letter and spirit of my note, it should extend to the sea. He added, that it was a point which they would never give up; though fundamentally inessential, it was indispensable to sustain the peace against the party opposed to it, which is inflaming the nation more and more. Finally after having vainly sought some expedient to give the desired turn to the affair, we decided that I should let My Lord Egremont see M. le Comte de Choiseul's letter before sealing it to return to him, and that I should read him confidentially the three letters of M. le Duc de Choiseul to Your Excellency of the 4th of this month, together with the Observations annexed on the memoir of France of the 28th of June last, substituting for the article of these last and for the paragraph of the long letter of M. Le Duc de Choiseul which begins with these words, *we have understood* and ends with the expression *we have not a little trouble to appease,* the two articles that you will see M. in the two leaves annexed;[16] to bring My Lord Egremont insensibly to what is implied by my note regarding the Mississippi; concerning which I cannot too often repeat to Your Excellency that no English minister knows of it but My Lord Bute, and that this affair might well ruin him, if ever it came to light, which would happen also to him and to My Lord Egremont if my letter on St. Lucia were ever known. I therefore let

[16] The effect on Egremont is made clear in the following clause, but the way it was to be produced is difficult to untangle. The long letter of the Duc de Choiseul referred to has not survived; and probably another of his notes is missing. The Observations referred to were sent from France on July 5. As one article of them referred to the Iberville boundary, a denatured version omitting the reference was made to be communicated to the English council. Side by side with it in the Viry-Solar correspondence is the paragraph substituted for the one in the long letter of Choiseul's that has disappeared. The substitute paragraph mentions the Iberville boundary as admitted, but as something on which Spain would have to be appeased. Possibly Viry meant to say he read the substituted paragraph of Choiseul's letter and the real article of the Observations. The substituted articles are in the Shelburne Papers, X, 287–290.

this latter lord see the letter of M. le Comte de Choiseul, and at the same time, read him confidentially the four pieces as I just told you.

He told me at first that if I had not read him these pieces and communicated the letter of M. le Comte de Choiseul, he would have thought the peace as good as made. Now he saw with regret that there was much to arrange. He would talk with My Lord Bute on the affair and then see what they would do.

They decided that My Lord Egremont should enable me to send off your courier with the answers already arranged to what he had brought, which Your Excellency will find annexed to my other large letter of to-day. He begged me to send back to Your Excellency the letter under flying seal of M. le Comte de Choiseul to this lord, dated the 4th inst., relying on the probity of Messieurs de Choiseul and that of Your Excellency that no one would ever know that letter had been written to him . . . .

I had the same day a very long conversation with My Lord Bute. He told me to write you Monsieur, in confidence, to say to Messieurs de Choiseul that if they wish to make peace, as being persuaded of their good faith and candor he does not doubt, France must send a memoir in reply to that of My Lord Egremont, expressed so it can be shown to the cabinet council, in which consequently there must be no chance of knowing or even suspecting in the least the secret understandings Your Excellency and Messieurs de Choiseul have had regarding the Mississippi, St. Lucia, and even Germany. By it France will allow everything she has definitely decided to allow, insisting on the cession of St. Lucia as an article and condition *sine qua non*. As to the Mississippi boundary, it must be proposed to England according to my note without speaking in any way of that note, it being well understood that the line of demarcation by the River Iberville, and Lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain goes to the sea, and that the navigation is to be common to the two nations.[17]

The French explained the boundary as a draftsman's error! They gave renewed assurance it should begin at the source and go to the sea![18] They gave assurance that the letter incriminating Egremont had been burned and would never arise to plague him. They also engaged the assistance of the English cabinet in hoodwinking Spain as to the cession to England extending as far as the Gulf of Mexico, a point on which she was adamant.[19] To this end they sent the article in two versions. One, authenticated by the signature of the Comte de Choiseul, stated that the line extended by the Iberville and Lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain as far as the sea, and appealed to marked maps for specific information. The other, intended to appease Spain's fears, omitted the phrase extending the line to the sea. The English ministers agreed to return the false article with the notation that it was approved, and without comment,

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 302–314.

[18] Solar to Viry, July 21, 1762, *ibid.*, pp. 338–340.

[19] Comte de Choiseul to Solar, July 21, 1762, *ibid.*, p. 370.

on the solemn assurance that it would be replaced by the secret article in the final treaty.[20]

Choiseul, however, was letting circumstances decide as to whether he would deceive his ally or his enemy, as his instructions to the Duc de Nivernais, his plenipotentiary to St. James's, reveal.[21] When the Duke of Bedford came over to Paris to negotiate in September he found the Spanish ambassador still uninformed as to the full extent of the Mississippi boundary concession. The Choiseuls pressed on Bedford a third compromise article more indefinite than ever. "France agrees to extend the limits of Canada to the Mississippi which shall serve as a barrier and be common to the two crowns; but it is stipulated that the possession of New Orleans remain to France." There was provision for a map.[22]

Suddenly the situation cleared. Choiseul at last recognized the necessity of telling Spain bluntly France would do as she pleased with her own, and Spain became more complaisant. The news of the capture of Havana brought about a revolution in the English cabinet, which decided to hasten the peace to a conclusion but to allow no further paltering on terms. A new Mississippi article which would allow of no shades of meaning and which dispensed with a map was extorted from the French; and the Preliminary Articles were signed.

In drafting the final articles Egremont attempted to improve England's position on the Mississippi. He assumed that the island on which New Orleans was situated did not extend southward as far as the sea, and that there would be a portion of the left bank below the city which would belong to England. He was apparently concerned with preventing the French from fortifying the east bank near the mouth.[23] But his articles called forth a protest from the Duc de Choiseul, through his cousin, the Comte de Choiseul, in which he appealed to the secret understanding of the preceding May. On December 26 the count wrote to Nivernais:

> You are otherwise well aware of all that concerns that article which has held an important place in our negotiation. It is the famous Article 6 on which we had given a secret note, and which much embarrassed us because of Spain; you should have, Monsieur, a copy of the note annexed to your instructions; but for greater certainty I am sending you a duplicate; it differs a little from Article 6 of the preliminaries; but the difference comes from the changes and addition made in England, which we have thought we should not reject because we could see no cause for discussion. But this note should

[20] Duc de Choiseul to Solar, July 21, 1762, *ibid.*, pp. 361–363.

[21] Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 447, f. 13.

[22] *Ibid.*, f. 112vo.

[23] Egremont to Bedford, Dec. 6, 1762, F. O., France, f. 255.

carry the point: it was adopted in England; and it was based on a first secret note which had been transmitted by M. de Mackenzie to M. le Comte de Viry who sent it to us. We were enjoined the greatest secrecy on it because it might ruin My Lord Bute who had given it without the knowledge of the council of the king of Great Britain. We have not betrayed the confidence of that worthy minister for whom we have the greatest consideration and who in truth interests us by the candor and uprightness which we have remarked in his character; he cannot disavow these facts, and we appeal today to his good faith. M. le Comte de Viry through whom the negotiation passed and who made it succeed by his zeal and adroitness will not deny what I say; and to complete the setting of this affair in full daylight I send you the original map annexed to the secret note. It is the same one we had sent to M. le Comte de Viry; it is indorsed in his secretary's hand; it was sent back to us because the line of demarcation marked in yellow did not extend as far as the sea, though that was our intention; and the English ministry feared from that that it was not sufficiently clear that Mobile was comprised in our cession. I therefore had the yellow line extended as it is today, and I sent back a duplicate of the map which remained at London.[24]

Nivernais on January 5, 1763, made a most interesting reply. He indicated that Bute was afraid of being compromised in Parliament by Egremont's artifices as having trespassed on the province of the secretary of state. He suspected that Egremont had letters in his hands to back the accusation, and that as a result since Parliament had met Bute dared not cross him.[25]

Finally of course the article was drawn according to the French contention with everything on the east bank of the Mississippi below the Iberville and the Lakes belonging to France. But the documents above quoted demonstrate that the Iberville boundary was assented to by Bute in unmistakable terms as early as May 4. If it was the fruit of Choiseul's trickery Bute had at least ratified it. The wording of Viry's note of May 4 may suggest a secret understanding with Solar and the Duc de Choiseul; it may even suggest that that secret understanding extended to Bute himself. At all events Egremont had to be let into the secret in the following July, and it was formally appealed to by Choiseul in December. How far does Nivernais's last hint explain Bute's retirement from office in March, leaving affairs in charge of a triumvirate of Grenville, Egremont, and Halifax, the three men who had been secretaries of state during the main part of the negotiation? Did Egremont's death in the succeeding August set Bute free from

[24] Comte de Choiseul to Duc de Nivernais, Dec. 26, 1762, Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 448, f. 425. Nivernais's reply to this was addressed to the Duc de Praslin, the former Comte de Choiseul, cousin of the Duc de Choiseul. The draft however is corrected in the Duc de Choiseul's hand, which is unmistakably bad.

[25] Nivernais to Praslin, Jan. 5, 1763, *ibid.*, vol. 449, f. 39.

danger for the moment? And lastly, how did the silky Earl of Shelburne, whose allegiance shifted from Fox to Bute and from Bute to Pitt, acquire copies of the correspondence that held Bute's guilty secret? If, as is most probable, he learned the secret it contained, what use if any did he make of it? The matter is vital not merely for an understanding of the development of the American wilderness; it may be vital also for that of the undercurrents of personal and factional politics in London in the days of George III.

THEODORE C. PEASE.

The University of Illinois.

DOCUMENTS

John C. Calhoun and the Presidential Campaign of 1824
Some Unpublished Calhoun Letters, II

XV

Washington
16th Nov 1823

My dear sir,

I do not think it would be worth while for Major Worth to apply for the present. The office will stand, as it now does, till the Constitutional question is somehow or other disposed of beween the Executive and the Senate. The latter would object to anyone, except Jones or Butler for the place.[39]

If any thing can be done for Smith it will afford me much pleasure. There is now no vacancy.

Gen. Swartwout should come on. Now is the important moment in your State. We must not relax; that fatal error after victory. The cause is great and glorious, but requires, like every thing great, efforts. The combination against the people is still powerful in your State, and unless we act with prudence and energy, the great principles of our party and the policy of the administration may be prostrated. Much has been done, but much remains to be done. What means the movement of the minority of the Repn Genl. Committee? [40]

You must organize against organization. Let your correspondence be active, particularly with Ohio, Penn., and North Carolina; and during the session of the legislatures but not neglecting other points. It is a powerful instrument to disseminate truth; and sound views.[41]

I have received both of yours of the 12th and of the 11th. Do acknowledge mine by date, so that I may know that they arrive safe.

With sincere regard
I am &c &c
J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

[39] William Jenkins Worth (1794–1849), commandant of cadets, U. S. M. A., 1820–1828, major general in the Mexican War. Roger Jones (1789–1852), adjutant general, 1825–1852. Robert Butler, recently resigned from the army, a ward of Andrew Jackson's and had served as his adjutant general, while Jackson was in command of the Southern Department.

[40] This refers to the effort of the minority in the Republican general committee to set aside or prevent altogether any action with respect to the choice of presidential electors in the state by popular vote. Rammelkamp, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

[41] J. G. Swift, *Memoirs*, p. 192, in which Swift writes "it was agreed that I should collect materials and publish a pamphlet to promote the election of John C. Calhoun". Swift, likewise, was commissioned "to correspond" with prominent men throughout the country. Note 38, *ante*.

XVI

Washington
3d Dec'r 1823

My dear sir,

Genl. Swartwout will put you in full possession of the actual state of things, and to him I would refer for full information.

In regard to Clinton, I think our course clear. He must take his own course and the less solicitude we discover, the less apt he will be to move. We may be assured that if he sees a prospect he will offer; and if there be any solicitude manifested by our friends, he will set it down to his supposed strength. If he moves, it will injure Adams, much more than myself; and we must treat him like all other candidates; that is, if he comes in collision resist him, and if not let him alone. I am not certain but that he may benefit us by his offering. Mr. C-d is down,[42] and Mr. Clay as a western man, and Mr. Adams as a Northern will be the most injured by his offering. It would tend to rally the Republicans of your State on me.

Do not attack him; but express no solicitude.

Let the Patriot take Democratick ground; and call on the Republicans to rally on the candidate who has been uniform and consistent, and who has the confidence of the people and the Administration. Our prospect never was so good. Through the Winter I must throw the burden of correspondence on the friends about me, as I shall have but little leisure.

Sincerely
J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

XVII[43]

Washington
5th Jan[y] 1824

My dear sir,

I have snatched a moment to write to you, least you should suppose that I had entirely[?] dropped a correspondence, which I find so agreeable.

We are doing well. Our friends were never in better spirits. As a proof of strength, I alone am assaulted by the whole Radical corps. Not one word is now said against Adams, Clay, or Jackson. This is the moment to repel attacks, and to strengthen our cause by demonstrating that it is founded in truth and principles. I trust, that I have so acted, that my defence will be an

[42] In the fall of 1823, Calhoun wrote George M. Dallas, his sponsor and supporter in Pennsylvania: "Crawford is certainly down without the hope of rising". *A L S*, Calhoun to Dallas, n. d. (fall of 1823), courtesy of Walter R. Benjamin, New York City. The reference is to Crawford's severe illness which was a principal reason for his not securing the presidential preference, not only with the voters, but, perhaps, also when the election was thrown into the House of Representatives. Clinton's actions puzzled some not in close touch with the political situation in New York. Maxcy wrote Wheaton in Albany, December 21, 1823 (Swift Papers), "What is the meaning of De Witt Clinton's movements? Is he to play marplot? Tell Haynes we hold him responsible for Mr Clinton's good conduct." He continued: "Many of those [in Maryland] who now count for Adams only want to be convinced that Calhoun is strong elsewhere to declare for him. Give me all the information you can. How do you come on? New York is the pivot and we have now since the death of Crawford few fears of Clay." The presence of this letter in the Swift Papers indicates that Wheaton forwarded it to Swift for his information.

[43] Calhoun Papers, The Library of Congress.

easy task to my friends. Your delegation here, I understand gives favourable symptoms. It is said, that both of the members from your district, are friendly inclined.

We deem N. Carolina, New Jersey and Pennsylvania as decidedly with us. Three months will exhibit a different face in the last State, and my friends are sanguine that my superiority will be apparent. Delaware is also thought to be decidedly with us. Of a majority of Maryland there can be but little doubt. Of your state and those of New England you are, I take it for granted, well advised. In the West my position as a second choice is strong.

There can be no caucus. In the present state of the publick mind, it would distract, rather than unite the publick sentiment. In fact it could not fail to divide the Republican party permanently. It is said that 19 states will not in any event go into caucus. I believe the calculation may be relied on.

With great respect

I am &c &c

J C. CALHOUN

Hon M. Sterling

[P. S.] If I can render Mr Ford any service, I will do it with great pleasure. But as the appointment goes through another Department, I can only come in aid. if the President [MS. ends here]

XVIII

Washington
25th Jany 1824

My dear sir,

I have but little time for correspondence during the session of Congress, which I hope will be a sufficient apology to my friends, for the brevity and tardiness of my communications.

Events have turned out in your State, different from what was calculated,[44] but I am not certain, that they have not taken the best possible direction. Your people must and will be roused; and when once roused the reign of corruption and intrigue will soon end. The daring attempt on the rights of the people cannot fail to react, and dreadful to the usurpers will be the reaction. Let our friends then frankly and boldly stand up for the people. It is the cause, which has rendered sacred the memory of the sages and heroes of the revolution. We are right; let us fear not.[45]

You may rest assured the cause is safe. The friends of all the other candidates stand opposed to a caucus; and whether they shall go and vote it down by an overwhelming majority, or stay away, and permit the faction to separate them from the Republican family and then evict them, is a mere matter of calculation. Either can be done. We can give them New York and still beat them with ease. Penna. is as firm as a rock. The 4th of March will develop her choice and we feel the fullest assurance, that it will be such, as we desire. Occupying that strong position, the friends of the people will rally

[44] The reference is to the insistence of the Radicals in continuing the existing practice of nominating presidential candidates by congressional caucuses instead of by popularly controlled nominating conventions. Rammelkamp, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

[45] J. C. Calhoun to John E. Calhoun, Jan. 30, 1824, Jameson, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 217.

with safety and their cause must triumph, even calculating on the worst, the loss of New York, through the usurpation of the Legislature.[46]

with sincere regards

I am &c &c

J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

XIX

Washington
16[th] April 1824

My dear sir,

I enclose an appointment for Master Casey for 1825.[47] He could not be appointed this year, as there was but one vacancy in East Jersey, and the whole delegation of the State joined in recommending another to fill it. The pressure for admission has been so great in your State and your son is so young, that I have deferred his appointment to another year, which I have no doubt will be better both for himself and the publick. Having one there now, had he been appointed this year, I have no doubt from the existing temper it would have caused much excitement.

[46] This letter indicates the extent to which Calhoun allowed himself to be carried by his optimism and apparent refusal to face facts. Two weeks before this letter was written the members of Congress from Pennsylvania were issuing a call for a meeting to nominate a candidate for the presidency. Three weeks later G. M. Dallas, Calhoun's Pennsylvania sponsor and supporter, in order to preserve his own leadership, threw his support to Jackson, by reading a resolution before the Harrisburg convention, nominating Jackson for President and Calhoun for Vice President. A Calhoun supporter who attended the convention wrote as his opinion that "as Jackson's friends were encreasing every day [the Calhoun adherents] thought it the most *prudent* course to join the strongest party. Having decided on this they publickly and promptly abandoned Mr Calhoun and swore fealty to General Jackson. . . . You will see too with how little ceremony, a genuine Phil[a]. politician [G. M. Dallas?] will abandon a sworn friend and go over to the enemy. . . ." (John Robertson, Harrisburg, to R. S. Garnett, Washington, Feb. 29, 1824—*A L S,* courtesy Walter R. Benjamin, New York City). Several weeks later the same observer again wrote: "Had it not been therefore, from the instructions given at some of the county meetings, and the extraordinary desertion of Dallas from Calhoun, this gentleman would probably have been nominated as the Penn[a] candidate. . . . Altho Penn[a] therefore is now seemingly pledged to support Jackson . . . yet I am fully persuaded that, if in the course of the summer, his election should appear doubtful the leaders of the party would desert him with as little ceremony as they lately deserted Calhoun." In connection with Jackson's nomination Robertson continued: "It is now said that letters received from Washington [indicate] that Jackson and Calhoun had come to an understanding on the subject; that Calhoun is to receive their united support for the Vice Presidency, and to succeed General Jackson at the end of four years. All I shall say is, that if Jackson has made such a bargain as this, and I hardly think his friends would make such a one without his knowledge, he is not the kind of a man, which they have hitherto represented him to be. For my own part, the accounts we hear of him are so contradictory, that I do not [know] what to think of him." Robertson to Garnett, Mar. 7, 1824, *ibid.*

[47] Nickname for Swift's son, Alexander J. Swift, who entered the United States Military Academy, July 1, 1826, and graduated four years later at the head of his class. He died April 24, 1847, as the result of disease incurred at the siege of Vera Cruz, Mexico.

I am much obliged to you for the offer in relation to the wine, but my stock is ample for the present. Judge Southard [48] had made his arrangement before I received your letter, or he would have been glad to avail himself of your kind offer.

I see you have called a convention to meet in Sept.[49] I think the measure judicious. All subordinate considerations ought to be dropped to give the highest possible effect to the measure. You owe a great debt to the Union. The faction has marked you for its own, and unless great efforts are made there is danger of its taking the State.

with sincere regards

J. C. CALHOUN

Gn[l] J G Swift

XX [50]

[n.d.]

[*My dear sir,*]

Confidential

What is the political prospect in your State? Will the electoral law be altered? Will the political convention be held? and who will be nominated there? What does Mr. Clinton and his friends intend? Are questions often asked, but which none but a New Yorker can answer, if they can be answered even by him? To the South the prospect is good. Mr. C-d south of Virginia has no chance but in Georgia, and I think he has a doubtful prospect there.

J.C.C.

XXI [51]

Washington

Confidential 10[th] Nov 1824

My dear sir,

Absence from the city, and the severe pressure of official duties in consequence thereof, since my return, have prevented an earlier acknowledgement of your interesting letter of the 24th Oct[r].

[48] Samuel L. Southard (1787–1842), United States senator from New Jersey, 1821–1823 and 1833–1842; Secretary of the Navy, 1823–1829; governor of New Jersey, 1832–1833.

[49] A meeting of those members of the New York State legislature who favored a change in the electoral law was held in Utica in April, 1824, and issued a call for a state convention to be held at Utica in the following September. The convention passed resolutions condemning nominations by legislative caucus. Before adjourning it appointed a "corresponding committee", the equivalent of what we would now call a campaign committee. Rammelkamp, *op. cit.*, pp. 195–196; Weed, p. 118.

[50] Calhoun's nomination to second place on a ticket with Jackson, by the Pennsylvania nominating convention in March, 1824, definitely eliminated Calhoun, for the time being, as a presidential aspirant. As the Republican vice presidential nominee, he received both Jackson and Adams support and was later elected without difficulty. As will be noted from the letter which follows, dated, probably, Washington, July 22, 1824, Calhoun's elimination from the presidential contest did not diminish his desire for Crawford's defeat. Crawford received the electoral votes of Virginia, Georgia, North Carolina, and Delaware, totaling 41 in all. This was sufficient to bring Crawford into the electoral college of the House of Representatives.

[51] The Library of Congress.

I was happy to hear from you, and will answer in that spirit of frankness, in which your letter is dictated.

I do not believe, that any portion of the administration took part in favour of Mr Clinton's election. I certainly know of no interference. I corresponded on the subject with a single individual only, I refer to Mr Gouverneur. What my opinions were he will fully communicate to you when he sees you. It will suffice for the present to say, that I did, and do still consider the bringing forward of Mr Clinton, as a misfortune. It is time for the State to settle down, and to recover from the former corrupt state of things, resulting from the Council of Appointment.[52] I fear this cannot be done under Mr Clinton, and that you have years of distraction before you. The opinion of the people of the State has been so long divided in relation to him, that it cannot be otherwise. It would, however, not be candid in me, were I not to state, that as between Mr Young[53] and him in the present contest, my inclination has been different from yours. I know nothing of the former gentleman. I saw at an early period, his importance in your State, and felt solicitous, that he should keep himself separate from the faction, which has its seat in Albany. The course of his friends in the Legislature, during the early period of the year, was highly satisfactory, but I confess with the lights before me, I could not doubt his final union with the enemies of the people. He took a nomination from them, and that in conjunction with one deeply implicated in the movements of the factions. At the call session, the conduct of his friends, was highly objectionable, which strongly tended to confirm my impressions, and I must add, that his letter was far from removing them. Thus viewing him, I could not, in principle, wish him success, even against Mr Clinton; for, in my opinion, no body of men has ever, in our country, so outraged the fundamental principles of our party, or done so much to bring it into discredit, as the Junto at Albany. The credit of the party could only be saved by utterly throwing them off, and withholding all fellowship and support from them. It was at least the misfortune, if not the fault of Col Young, that he permitted himself to be placed in a situation, in which his advancement depended on the men, who had thus sinned against the people and principles of our government; and, if successful, to them he must have looked for continuance in power. From what you state, I infer, that he was thus placed more from weakness, than vice, but I apprehend, that, from necessity, he would not have been less an instrument in their hands. Thus regarding

[52] The Council of Appointment, as suggested by John Jay in 1777, was designed to prevent abuses of power through control of appointments either by the governor or the legislature. It was Jay's intention that the governor should nominate by and with the advice of the council, which in practice was composed of four members of the state senate "from each great district". In time, the council came to dominate in matters of nomination and appointment and became a political tool under the control of the dominant party rather than an organization acting in the public interest. Through its control by De Witt Clinton it eventually brought about the political destruction of Aaron Burr. When of the opposite party, the council was able to reduce the governor to the position of a mere figurehead. When the New York State constitution was revised in 1821, the council was abolished. Hammond, I, 43, 168 f.; II, 64–78; DeAlva Stanwood Alexander, *Political History of the State of New York*, I, 11, 115–116, 119, 311.

[53] Samuel Young (1778–1850). Rammelkamp, *op. cit.*, p. 191; Hammond, II, 156–157, 174; Alexander, I, 327, 332–333; II, 157–158.

the case, I did think, and do still think, that the sanction of the conduct of the Junto, which seems to me would have been implied in the election of Col Young, under all of the circumstances, would have been a greater misfortune to the State and party, than any that can result from the election of Mr Clinton, as great, as I apprehend they may be. The example afforded by the result of the election, may be even considered as highly salutory. It will teach politicians, I trust, forever, that the people will not tolerate the violation of fundamental principles, under whatever profession, it may be made, and with whatever art it may be attempted to be concealed; and the more deep and universal the objection to Mr Clinton, the more powerfully this great truth is inculcated by his success.[54]

If there be any project to bring him [Young?] into the cabinet, by either [of] the gentlemen to whom you refer, I am ignorant of the fact. I have heard such a rumour in case of the success of the General [Jackson?], but a most confident friend of his assured me two months since, that there was nothing in it. The step would be a most imprudent one. If I have a just conception of his character, he will give much trouble, and cause much distraction to any administration, of which he may be the member.

I would be much gratified to be favored with the light of your confidence and observation, at any time, either in relation to the state, or our general politicks; and be so kind as to let me know, that this letter is received.

With sincere regard

I am &c &c

J C Calhoun

Hon S[mith] Thompson

XXII

Washington

20th Nov 1824

My dear sir,

Your letters have been very acceptable during the great trial. The victory is great.[55] Our country has a right to rejoice. The overthrow of the most

[54] Calhoun's remarks, of course, refer to Colonel Samuel Young's candidacy for governor of New York in opposition to De Witt Clinton. The sinister figure, which moves about behind the scenes manipulating men to his will is probably Martin Van Buren, then a United States senator and prime mover and controller of the Junto. Rammelkamp, *op. cit.*, pp. 177 f., 191 f.; Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 145, 147–148.

[55] The reference is to the vote resulting from the joint session of the New York State senate and assembly. The result was the choice of 25 electors for Adams, 7 for Clay, and 4 for Crawford. This was somewhat changed when the electoral college met in December, 1824, but not so far as it affected Adams and Calhoun. The vote was a distinct rebuke to the Regency party and brought about the desired change in the electoral law. Rammelkamp, *op. cit.*, pp. 199–200; Weed, pp. 122–127; Hammond, II, 177. Calhoun was equally jubilant over the national outcome. The electoral vote for President was: Jackson, 99; Adams, 84; Crawford, 41; and Clay, 37. For Vice President, Calhoun received 182 out of a total of 261 electoral votes cast. Because no presidential candidate received a majority of the votes cast, the final choice was made by the House of Representatives, voting by states, for a choice from the three highest candidates. Because he was the candidate of the now discredited congressional caucus and because of the pre-

dangerous faction, which has ever appeared in our country, is complete. Among the happy results will be an increased confidence in our admirable system, which seems to acquire new vigour instead from every trial.

Our friends have all done nobly; and are entitled to the thanks of the country. I feel a pride in reflecting that the victory in your great State is almost wholly owing to the wisdom, firmness and disinterestedness of our friends. Had they given away all would have been lost.

I cannot venture an opinion on the project to which you refer in one of your letters; as so much will depend on circumstances, not within my knowledge. Should its execution be put into the hands of able and honest men the success would probably be brilliant; but the very opposite would result from the urging of the weak and dishonest.

Altho I have been placed in political opposition with Mr. E.[56] I have not failed to entertain a very favorable opinion of him, and have on more than one occasion so expressed myself, where it might be of service to him. Should I have an opportunity, I will not fail to do him ample justice to Mr. S-r.[57] His great victory, capital and fidelity to his engagements will justify whatever may be said in his commendation.

with sincere regard

I am &c &c

J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

XXIII

Washington

10[th] March 1825

Strictly Confidential

My dear sir,

I have seized the first leisure on the termination of my official duties to renew our correspondence on my part.[58] We have passed through many and strange events during the last winter, which are but little known to the country. The result of which is, that we have triumphed in part and been

carious state of his health, Crawford was eliminated from serious consideration. The final choice lay between Jackson and Adams, with the odds favoring Jackson. Calhoun, by steering a neutral middle course as between the two leading candidates, hoped to be the heir apparent, regardless of whether Adams or Jackson should be chosen.

[56] Probably Henry Eckford (1775–1832), a prominent naval architect and friend of Swift who was supporting Crawford. He had acquired a controlling interest in the *National Advocate*.

[57] The reference is probably to Judge Ambrose Spencer or to his nephew, John C. Spencer (1788–1855), speaker of the New York assembly, 1820–1821, and for many years active in New York state and national politics.

[58] The elevation of Adams to the presidency as a result of the so-called "bargain" with Clay, acted to release Calhoun from any obligation he might have felt toward Adams. Though he took no part in the canvass which preceded our second (and last) election inside Congress, privately, he adopted a pro-Jackson attitude. He felt Adams's election unfairly secured and in opposition "to the will of the people". His prophecy of Jackson's elevation in succession to Adams and of the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution was not wholly realized. He, of course, did not foresee that events proceeding from Jackson's elevation to the presidential office would effectively bar him from the succession and change the whole course of his career.

defeated in part. The policy of Mr. Monroe's administration I consider fixed. He is too popular to be attacked. This is a great point; but there ends our victory. The mass of political and moral power, which carried the late administration through in triumph, has been wholly neglected in the new organization; and in the final stages of the election, the voices and the power of the people has been set at naught; and the result has been a President elected not by them, but by a few ambitious men with a view to their own interest, I fear. This result has caused the deepest discontent, and in my opinion deservedly. There is a solemn feeling of duty, that it must be corrected at another election, or the liberty of the country will be in danger. It is my opinion, that the country will never be quiet till the example is corrected, and the Constitution so amended as to prevent the recurrence of the danger. The country will appear to subside, but the appearance will be deceitful. Principles cannot be violated in this country with impunity. In four years all that has happened will be reversed, and the country will settle down on sound principles, and wise policy.

As to myself, I do not think of moving under existing circumstances. I know the force of my position, and my friends need not fear, I trust, either ambition, or imprudence on my part. I however, cannot but see what must come; and I shall never separate from principles, let the consequences be what it may. I see in the fact that Mr. Clay has made the Pres't. against the voice of his constituents, and that he has been rewarded by the man elevated by him by the first office in his gift, the most dangerous stab, which the liberty of this country has ever received. I will not be on that side. I am with the people, and shall remain so. I would say much more but you can get all the information which you may desire from Gou'r [S.L.Gouverneur].

I enclose an answer to the invitation of the Committee. I do not know whether it is as it ought to be. If not keep it to yourself; but if it is do with it as you may think proper.

I deeply deplore the health of poor Haines. I will write to my friends in Charleston to see that he receives due attention.

with great respect

I am &c &c
J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

XXIV

Pendleton [S. C.]
27[th] June 1825

Confidential

My dear sir,

The last mail brought your's of the 13th inst. which I have read with interest.

Events have taken, with but little exception, the course which I anticipated; and are in the main not undesireable. It is manifest, that no systematic opposition will be formed to the measures of the administration, unless indeed they should be systematically wrong. Each will be supported or opposed on its own merits. This is right. I cannot believe that the kind of opposition which exists habitually in England, and long existed in this country, belongs naturally to our system. It grows out of an organization

entirely different from ours. In England it is the only means by which an odious and wicked ministry can be hampered and turned out; but here it can be effected by a far more simple and desireable process; I mean the ballot box. The people feel this, and hence are properly quiet, under all that has occurred. The time comes when they may act and then a sense of their wrongs will be manifest. It must be so; for it certainly admits of no doubt, that the example of the last election by the House, and the acts of him who was elected identifying himself with it, must be reversed; or we must cease to be a Republic. As it now stands, the election hereafter will go habitually to the House, where under the cover of the recent example, if not reversed, the country will be as regularly sold, as the Roman Crown was by the Pretorian Band. To prevent so dreadful a calamity, the constitution must be amended, and the example reversed. Both are necessary, if to preserve our Liberty be important.

Your conception as to the late election in Charleston is not wholly correct.[59] Nothing was better known than that the successful candidate was opposed, and the defeated in favor, of the existing order of things, tho' it was not thought desirable to open the campaign at the time, or place.

I do not in the least doubt the course of events. I never saw them more clearly. No art or management can change them. The South will be wholly united.[60]

With great respect

I am &c &c

J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

XXV

Pendleton [S. C.]

Confidential

2[d] Sept 1825

My dear sir,

I have read with much interest your letter of the 18th August.

Acting, as I always have, on fixed principles, I have at least one great advantage, that I am never embarassed in my course. My friends may rest assured, that faction cannot reach me; nor, as I trust, my particular friends. My views of principles and policy are well understood; and so far from changing them in the new position, in which I have been placed by circumstances, I appeal to them as the standard, by which I wish to be judged. Those who

[59] The reference is probably to the contest in South Carolina between Senator Robert Y. Hayne, Calhoun's protégé, and William Smith, former United States senator from South Carolina and a Crawford supporter. Theodore D. Jervey, *Robert Y. Hayne and his Times*, pp. 169 ff.

[60] In the absence of General Swift's letters to Calhoun it is not possible to determine definitely what the South was to be united for. The earlier correspondence does not reveal any worry by Calhoun at this date in regard either to the protective tariff or slavery. In the summer of 1825, shortly after this letter was written, Calhoun said at Augusta, Ga.: "No one would reprobate more pointedly than myself any concerted union between States for interested or sectional objects" (quoted in H. von Holst, *John C. Calhoun* p. 67).

accuse me of ambition will at least be compelled to acknowledge in the end that my ambition is subordinate to my attachment to principles. Mr. Clay's fate I never doubted. It is fixed. I am only surprised (considering the means in his power to influence the publick sentiment) that it should so soon be made manifest. I pity him. He has not only fallen, but has fallen under such circumstances, as will make him miserable for life. He has good and even great qualities, but his character is not well balanced. He will doubtless share the lot of all, who in a great crisis, permit themselves to be governed more by an eye to their own advantage, than their duty to their country. The folly (to call it by no other name) of Mr. Adams begins to be manifest to the South. The attempt to secure Mr. C-d, and his partisans in Virginia and the Southern States has wholly failed. They are deadly hostile to him and his administration almost to a man, as far as my information extends; and are now, if I mistake not, in active operation to embarass and weaken him. From this source springs the Georgia movement;[61] and hence the blending of the Slave with the Indian question, in order, if possible, to consolidate the whole South. Against these movements what can sustain the administration in this quarter? Gen'l Jackson's friends and mine have both been regarded, not as friends but enemies; and though far from having a wish to embarass the administration, they cannot be its active supporters. I see and regret the result. Weakness, and distraction must follow, from which, to recover the country will require years of wisdom and firmness. How different the result, had Mr. Adams had the sagacity to place himself not only on the policy of the late administration, but on its supporters; that is, on his own friends, those of Gen'l Jackson, and mine, and a considerable portion of Mr. Clay's. It seems strange, that he should embrace the policy of Mr. Monroe's administration and at the same time look mainly to those, who had been most opposed to it, for support! No one can regret, what has occured more deeply than myself, tho I doubt not, it has placed me in a situation far better calculated to confound those, who have been so busy in misrepresenting my character and motives, than any other that I could occupy.

In relation to Mr. D., and the subject to which you and he conversed, I have on due reflection determined not to come to any conclusion, till I reach Washington; when I shall have full view of the whole ground. I believe him to be a man of talents, and his fidelity, even to one, who thought proper to put himself so much in opposition to me, is far from lessening him in my esteem.

I have noted the course of the Advocate.[62] Let it be prudent. Look to principles and policy. Men may fail, but they, unless our whole system is a deception, must triumph. It is important that its course should be right. Mrs. C. and her mother join their best regards to you and Mrs. S.

with sincere regard

I am &c &c

J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

[61] Calhoun here refers to the conflict over Georgia Indian lands, which resulted in a quarrel between that state and the United States Supreme Court. Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, "Georgia and State Rights", A. H. A., *An. Rep.*, 1901, vol. II, pp. 75 f.; Albert J. Beveridge, *The Life of John Marshall*, IV, 539 ff.

[62] New York *National Advocate*, edited by M. M. Noah.

XXVI

Abbeville [S. C.]
11th Oct 1825

My dear sir,

I may say that I am thus far on my way. I will, however, be long on the road; and do not expect to reach Washington till the 20th Nov. I have read your letter with great interest. It is evident that events begin to shape themselves in your State; but it will be some time before we shall see their true bearings. There is not a word of truth as to the report of the activity of my friends in giving a certain direction to things, particularly in Ohio. Our course is fixed. While others are struggling to obtain place, we shall strive to preserve principles and to see that the Republick take no harm. I am distressed at the information in relation to your son.[63] It seems to be a very hard case, and trust that what has been done will be reversed. I do not know, however, that there will be much respect for my opinion at the head of the office.

with great respect
I am &c &c
J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

[P. S.] I have turned farmer since my return home; and wish to make an experiment on plaister of Paris; and will be much obliged to you to forward for me to Bonneau and Mathews factors, Charleston with request to send it to McKinzey and Ponce my factors in Augusta one ton of ground plaister of Paris. I wish great care to be had in the selection so as to make the experiment a fair one. Draw on Mr. Vandeventer[64] for the expense and forward the plaister as soon as you can make it convenient.

J. C. C.

XXVII

Washington
11th Dec[r] 1825

My dear sir,

I have not yet tried the wine, but do not doubt but that I shall find it very good. I am obliged to you for obtaining the Plaister. Let me know to whom you have delivered, and what is the cost.

The result of your election[65] has changed the aspect of things much in your State, and to the disadvantage of the individual to whom you refer.

It is difficult to form any opinion of the real state of things here. I am of the impression the message [Adam's] has failed to give satisfaction both in manner and matter. Most think that efforts at fine writing is much misplaced in composition of the kind. Still greater fault is found in the matter. The friends of state rights object to it as utterly ultra, and those, who in the main,

[63] General Swift's son, James, who was dismissed from West Point in September, 1825, for drinking at the grog shop of the celebrated Benny Havens.

[64] Christopher Vandeventer, chief clerk of the War Department, n. 29 *ante*.

[65] At the election of November, 1825, in New York, the voters adopted, by a large majority, the proposal to choose presidential electors by state-wide ballot instead of by legislative caucus.

advocate a liberal system of measures, think that the message has recommended so many debatable subjects at once, as to endanger a reaction even to those measures heretofore adopted and apparently acquiesced in.

with great regard

I am &c &c

J C CALHOUN

Gn[l] J G Swift

[P. S.] On consultation with our friends here on my arrival as to your son it was thought useless after the indications in relation to him, to attempt anything in his favor. I deeply regret it, and am still prepared should it be thought that there is the slightest prospect to exert myself in his behalf.

J. C. C.

[P. S.] I will thank you to request the editors of the National Advocate and the Statesman to send me their country paper as a subscriber.

J. C. C.

XXVIII

Washington

15[th] Jan[y] 1826

My dear sir,

[The first part of this letter deals with "wine" and "Plaister".]

The case of your son appears to me to be one of the hardest which I have ever known. Shortly after my return from the South, I made very particular enquiry in relation to it, and consulted some friends whether my interference could be of the least service. The impression was that it could do no good, and I accordingly wrote to you to that effect. I fear from your silence that you have not received my letter. Between ourselves, I would fear if there be any disposition to yield, which is thought not to be the fact, my interference would weaken rather than strengthen that disposition. It cannot be doubted that I am viewed with some jealousy. If, however, you should think otherwise, I will feel not the least hesitation to speak freely to the Secretary in relation to your son's case, as I am only restrained by the fear of doing an injury, instead of good, or at least from the belief, that I can do no good.

In a few days the proceedings of Congress will become interesting. The amendment of the Constitution [66] will be before the body; and is destined to have much influence on the political operations of the country. Whether it will succeed this time is doubtful, but its final success, and its prostration of those who oppose it, I do not doubt. It is founded in the elementary principles of Representative Democracy. I hope the Advocate will not only go right, but zealously right on this great subject.

with great regard

I am &c &c

J C CALHOUN

Gn[l] J G Swift

[66] Calhoun here refers to the efforts made to amend the Constitution to make certain that a repetition of the situation in the electoral college in the fall of 1824 could not occur again. The Constitution was not amended, but changes in practice and procedure accomplished the purposes contemplated by amendment. Herman V. Ames, Proposed Amendments to the Constitution, A. H. A., *An. Rep.*, 1896, vol. II, pp. 87 f.

XXIX

Washington
19th Febr 1826

My dear sir,

I received your letter with the enclosure, which I disposed of as you requested. There has been so much misrepresentation, on the subject to which it refers, that I do not believe, that the attack, tho made on the floor of Congress, has made much impression. Rumor is no less busy here, than in New York. There are those, who are not satisfied, that all of the measures of the administration, (which possibly can consistently with duty) should be supported by myself and those who have acted with me. We must be identified with them, and give an unqualified support or be denounced, as in opposition. We must go farther, we must pledge a support to Mr. A's re-election, and recommend all of those principles, for which we have ever contended, in favor of the Democratick basis of our government. There must be opposition in the opinion of those zealous advocates; and I make it, if we do not oppose them, they must oppose us. Be it so. One can make war, tho it takes two to make peace. If we are to be assaulted at all events, *it is only left to defend.* Acting defensively, we will at least have choice of position; and occupying as we do, the great Democratick principles, on which our whole political institution rests, I do not fear, that our position can be forced or turned.

I have had a communication from Mr. Casey of your City enclosing a number of the Globe and Emerald containing his composition, which he desires to be printed in one of the papers here. At this season, when all the papers are crowded, with the proceedings of Congress, it is impossible to gratify his wish; and even were there leisure, I have no communication with any of the Editors of the District, and could not be the channel of communication with them.

Mr. Casey is very desirous of an appointment, and I would be highly gratified with his success as I believe, he is well qualified for most of the executive offices. But I can do nothing. There is nothing in my gift and I am so circumscribed that I cannot ask.

with great regard

I am &c &c
J C Calhoun

Gn[l] J G Swift

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF GENERAL HISTORY

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission. Report of the Commission on the Social Studies. [American Historical Association.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1934. Pp. xi, 168. $1.25.)

THE Commission on the Social Studies could hardly have reported their *Conclusions and Recommendations* at a more timely moment. Rarely in the country's history have the rank and file of the public been so anxious about economic and political affairs as at present. Yet when one looks back at the schooling which the present generation has had as a preparation for intelligent action in its concerns, one might well manifest anxiety as to the outcome. The social studies—geography, history, and civics—should have prepared us to meet this crisis. These subjects, however, were taught too much as descriptions of structure and events and not sufficiently as instruments for developing in the oncoming body of citizens specifically informed opinion about particular causes and definite ways of easing the predominant points of strain in our contemporary social fabric.

Approximately a dozen committees more or less national in scope have met since 1892 to ponder either mainly or in part how the schools might more adequately discharge their social obligation.[1] Their major emphasis lay in the direction of enlarging the number of social studies, emphasizing the economic content of these courses, improving the presentation of material, arranging the order and the years in which these courses should be given. Rather extended details were assigned to indicate how these suggestions might be achieved.

In spite of the work of these committees the third decade of the present century drew to a close with a feeling in professional circles that the social studies were still failing to meet effectively the actualities of contemporary society. The buckling of the economic order in 1929 and the rapid transitions which have taken place since then have greatly accentuated this feeling. After five years of careful study the present Commission has made a departure in its *Conclusions and Recommendations* by indicating that the real focus of our trouble is not so much in the detailed selection, organization, and method of presentation of the social studies as the "frame of reference" into which they fit. Two sides of this frame raise especially important questions: (1) What

[1] For a review of the work of these committees down to 1923, see *Twenty-second Yearbook* of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, pt. II, ch. 4.

shall be the attitude of the school toward instruction in those areas of our culture which are highly controversial? (2) What kind of society shall the social studies assume as a pattern for reference?

Hitherto our prevalent philosophy has been that the school should be neutral on controversial issues, that it should present evidence from varied angles but withdraw from any partisanship which might explode social dynamite. The fear of such a detonation has usually operated to cause the school to stop amply short of social actualities. The Commission now seeks to close this gap between school and society by disavowing the ideal of "disinterestedness". It holds:

> In the sphere of moral decision and choice the very refusal to choose, since refusal has specific consequences, is itself a moral act. The fact is now generally realized that a declaration to do nothing is itself a statement of policy. In so far as the commitments of educators, scholars, and citizens have consequences for the determination of social issues, moral responsibility for things left undone, as well as for things done, cannot be escaped. The important thing then is to become conscious of responsibilities and to develop the discussion, not only in terms of the validity of knowledge, but also in terms of the values for which knowledge is used (pp. 28–29).

The teacher of social studies is consequently urged to abandon his impeccable neutrality, his position of conservator of "established values", in favor of becoming an active partisan, a creator of new implements for social amelioration. From such a vantage point the teacher will the more readily find it possible to introduce the youth under his charge to a realistic view of the contradictory and rapidly changing social milieu.

The Commission forsees and makes suggestions on many difficulties in the way of actually framing school and society in this new relationship. When teachers act their new rôles they will be almost certain to arouse bitter antagonisms. Thorough protection will be needed in their tenure of office. The community will have to be convinced that the infinitive "to teach" does not mean to propagandize but rather to develop thinking. The professional preparation of teachers will have to be greatly advanced to produce the exceptional teachers who will easily and quickly merit the community's confidence on matters of such momentous importance. Such teachers will need an economic security and income commensurate with so high a calling. Boards of education will need a broader and higher type of membership to be able to appreciate this enlightened outlook.

So far the *Conclusions and Recommendations* need occasion no very great surprise. They but propose for concerted action what has often been idealized by the profession. It is a position which has been won—though not without the necessity of constantly rewinning it—for academic freedom in our better universities. Whether the public and the teachers in the public schools are

prepared for its extension downward may well be doubted by some. How many communities are there that are really willing to confide their deepest convictions to the jeopardy of thought? However, if the direction be right, the start must be made at some time. Perhaps the main objective can be achieved gradually and without too great disturbance to the ever unstable social equilibrium.

This, however, is not the only way to vitalize the social studies. The social studies may more effectively integrate the youth with social realities if these studies are quick to anticipate the kind of social order which is just emerging into view. The Commission diligently studied the signs of our times. Drawing on the reports of a number of congressional investigations and of such national commissions as those on law enforcement, child welfare, housing conditions, cost of medical care, economic and social trends, the Commission comes to the final conclusion:

> Educators stand to-day between two great philosophies of social economy: the one representing the immediate past and fading out in actuality, an individualism in economic theory which has become hostile in practice to the development of individuality for great masses of the people and threatens the survival of American society; the other representing and anticipating the future on the basis of actual trends—the future already coming into reality, a collectivism which may permit the widest development of personality or lead to a bureaucratic tyranny destructive of ideals of popular democracy and cultural freedom.
>
> If education continues to emphasize the philosophy of individualism in economy, it will increase the accompanying social tensions. If it organizes a program in terms of a philosophy which harmonizes with the facts of a closely integrated society, it will ease the strains of the transition taking place in actuality (pp. 36–37).

This bold and fearless point of view colors every section of the report. If the members of the Commission perceive our social destiny without mistake then there can be no question but that the improvement of the social studies program depends directly and immediately on a collectivistic orientation. Again, if the direction is right, a start should be made. But is the direction right? No part of the report is so likely to generate disagreement as this clear-cut statement of philosophy.

Some will at once fear that the Commission's collectivism is a radical departure from our fundamental concept of liberty. They should read the report carefully to see that collectivism is understood not as an alternative to individual freedom but rather as a means to the "widest development of personality". Others with objections to specific details of collectivism will still remain unconvinced. Here the Commission says:

> As to the specific form which this "collectivism," this integration and

interdependence, is taking and will take in the future, the evidence at hand is by no means clear or unequivocal. It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property or it may entail the preservation of private property, extended and distributed among the masses. Most likely, it will . . . represent a composite of historic doctrines and social conceptions yet to appear. Almost certainly it will involve a larger measure of compulsory as well as voluntary co-operation of citizens in the conduct of the complex national economy, a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention in fundamental branches of economy previously left to individual discretion and initiative—a state intervention that in some instances may be direct and mandatory and in others indirect and facilitative (pp. 16–17).

All these, however, are very controversial points. Many will complain that it is no business of the school to make determinations on these matters. The Commission squarely faces this issue. As a social institution education must have a location in some particular time and place. To fail to frame the social studies with reference to what they have actually determined to be the emerging social conditions in the United States of 1934 is to dislocate the school from actuality and to perpetuate its past inefficiencies.

But do conditions point unerringly to collectivism as the frame of reference? It must be conceded that there is honest and intense difference of opinion here. This redirects attention again to a consideration of the first and main side of the Commission's frame of reference, the proper attitude of the school toward the teaching of controversial issues. If the school is to participate effectively here, as the Commission recommends, the supporting public will need to be assured that the school is not made the vehicle for the propagation of a particular viewpoint. The Commission, however, has so definitely espoused the collectivistic viewpoint that it at once undermines this assurance. How can teachers be committed to collectivism and yet be "peculiarly dissociated from every special group concerned with the advancement of some narrow end" (p. 125)? Perhaps the Commission's collectivism is not narrow. It will, however, take no end of argument to prove the case, an argument which in the end may result in distracting attention to a discussion of the merits of collectivism rather than how the social studies program may be improved. There is thus danger that the two main sides of the Commission's frame of reference are either not well joined or incapable of being joined.

The necessity for locating the social studies in time and place may be conceded but doing so is not simply a problem of physics. There is also a social dimension which manifests much greater variability than the other two. In contemporary America there are many conflicting social philosophies contending for adoption. Would it not, therefore, be more realistic for the school to aid its clientele to make a choice between them rather than seem, as the Commission does, to assume one and apparently restrict choice merely to the form and means through which that one shall be realized?

What are the next steps? One might expect them to lie in the direction of the construction of syllabuses, textbooks, and similar paraphernalia consistent with the aims expounded. Many will be disappointed that, unlike former committees, this Commission considered itself without a mandate for so specific an enterprise. The Commission did deal with "materials of instruction", "method of teaching", and "tests and testing", but it did so generally and with main attention to the "frame of reference". Since the "frame of reference", the philosophy, is so preëminent, the Commission has fittingly selected as the immediate task the need for winning leaders to their philosophy of education. And as four members of the Commission refused to sign the report, it may be concluded that the focus of attention is exactly where it should be—on the soundness of the philosophy. When this issue is resolved, the individuality and ingenuity of the leaders can be depended on, as the Commission repeatedly asserts, to suggest a variety of ways of securing the more distant objective.

Yale University. JOHN S. BRUBACHER.

Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. Editor-in-Chief, EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN; Associate Editor, ALVIN JOHNSON. Volumes XI, XII, XIII, *Morbidity-Service.* (New York: Macmillan Company. 1933–1934. Pp. xxi, 639; xxi, 716; xxii, 674. $7.50 each.)

THE *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* will some day be a priceless document for the historian's study of the second quarter of the twentieth century. In the three latest volumes it reflects more clearly than ever the uncertainties and the conflicts in thought which are at the same time the result and the cause of the confusion of our age. A few samples will illustrate. J. M. Rubenow under the title, "Poverty", looks at the maladjustments within the contemporary social scene and arrives at the safe but not very penetrating conclusion that "the question whether abolition of poverty does or does not require complete reorganization of the very fundamentals of modern industrial society remains and is likely to remain for many years . . .". F. W. Coker, surveying the attack of the pluralists upon the monistic conception of the state, stresses the importance for pluralism of Laski's doctrine that "the only tolerable sovereign in society and the only valid source of law is the individual conscience". Distant a few pages is the affirmation of A. R. Radcliffe-Brown that "what is called conscience is . . . the reflex in the individual of the sanctions of society". The dogmatism of both Laski and Radcliffe-Brown is rebuked by Edward Sapir in his discussion of "Personality". "With all the uncertainty that now prevails with regard to the relative permanence or modifiability of life patterns in the individual and in the race it is unwise . . . to force the notion of the fixation of personality in time". All three writers reflect the rationalistic tendencies of the modern world and challenge by

implication the age-old position of religion that conscience is in some way connected with a divine power in the cosmos. Edward Bertholet undertakes to speak the modern mind with respect to religion and at the end of a long discourse leaves the subject about where it stood immediately after the appearance of the first human skeptic. "At one extreme", he says, "stands Hegel's conception of religion as a process working itself out within the being of God; at the other Feuerbach's conclusion that it is an illusion spun by man."

To those who pin their faith to reason Donald Slesinger and Mary Stephenson in their article on "Research" present the disturbing and illogical phenomenon in the present rationalistic age of the "lowering of the type of intelligence attracted to the social sciences". The authors hope that, as a result of the vigorous selection of the depression era, social scientists will appear who, instead of merely collecting "data", will "think more about the material in hand". This pious wish suggests that faith in progress which has buoyed up so many of those moderns led by reason to abandon their old-fashioned but comfortable religious arks. Carl Becker, however, under the title, "Progress", hammers at the fingers of all such who cling to this particular spar in a tempestuous sea. "But if we take the still longer perspective", he warns, "and estimate the universe as a whole . . . in terms of cosmic energy, then progress and the very existence of man himself becomes negligible and meaningless. In such a perspective we should see the whole life of man on the earth as a mere momentary ripple on the surface of one of the minor planets in one of the minor stellar systems."

Nor does the *Encyclopaedia* fail to reflect the dilemma of those physical scientists investigating minor and major stellar systems as well as the vagaries of electrons and neutrons. These moderns have been driven by twentieth century physics from the apparently firm and stable foundation of the materialism of Galileo and Newton into the dangerous realm of idealism. "Thus Kant", concluded C. E. M. Joad in his article on "Realism", "has taken the place of the realists as the philosopher most congenial to modern physics." Idealism, as some of the natural scientists have already demonstrated, swings easily round the circle to religion and the physicist has already made the painful discovery that in the unfamiliar realm of philosophy he may find himself playing the rôle of a naïve amateur. Horace Kallen in the essay on "Pragmatism" suggests the battles in the philosophers' domain which rage about closed systems "establishing once and for all the ultimate nature and destiny of man and the universe". For all such systems he affirms pragmatism "dissolves dogmas into beliefs, eternities and necessities into change and chance, conclusions and finalities into processes". He adds a little ruefully, however, that pragmatism is not widely accepted by the philosophical guild because "men have invented philosophy precisely because they find change, chance, and process too much for them, and desire infallible security and certainty".

Clearly the *Encyclopaedia* mirrors the intellectual confusion of a generation that has lost its moorings and has failed to find a guiding principle in a cosmos wherein all appears to be flux.

Sometimes the historian, as he watches his contemporaries run after the latest popular economist or hang upon the words of the prophet of science, wonders about his function in the contemporary scene with its feverish search for the new. Perhaps he reflects that intellectual confusion and frustration in an age is not for him a new phenomenon. No doubt he attributes some of the difficulties of the time to its extreme specialization. But even as he does so he finds himself retreating as the economist, the political scientist, and even the lowly sociologist add to their bailiwicks by appropriating areas of his domain. Perhaps he thinks unpleasantly of the ungrateful brood which has sprung from history and which now seeks to disintegrate the past and distribute it among the familiar intellectual cartons of the present. The confusion which the *Encyclopaedia* illustrates suggests the need for forces of integration in the contemporary swirl of thought. It is no accident that philosophy daily increases in importance. Its weakness, however, lies in its tendency to work only at the level of ideas. For the historian specific philosophies, or the lack of them, are the resultants of the conditions of human life in particular places and ages. Perhaps the time has come for the historian to cease thinking of his undertaking as the pursuit of merely another speciality in the field of knowledge and to return frankly to his ancient task of attempting to encompass wholes. At the level of ideas the historian can look down upon a particular culture with the perspective of the philosopher. At the level of social action he can see old ideas at work and new ones in the process of formation. All aspects of human life and thought are his domain and rounded and integrated knowledge of human experience in intellectual and social endeavor is the one foundation for poise in a disordered and disorderly epoch.

Yale University. RALPH H. GABRIEL.

A Study of History. By ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE, Director of Studies in the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Research Professor of International History in the University of London. Volumes I–III. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1934. Pp. xvi, 476; vii, 452; vi, 551. $17.50.)

THESE three volumes are installments of a general plan to embrace in all thirteen parts: Introduction; the geneses of civilizations, the growths of civilizations, the breakdowns of civilizations, the disintegrations of civilizations; universal states, universal churches; heroic ages; contacts between civilizations in space, contacts between civilizations in time; rhythms in the

histories of civilizations; the prospects of the Western civilization; the inspirations of historians. Parts one, two, and three are now before us.

Mr. Toynbee seems to imagine that he is proceeding empirically, uncontrolled by any avowed assumptions or by any presuppositions of *Weltgeschichte*. He says that "Societies, not states, are 'the social atoms' with which students of history have to deal". He then selects certain societies or social atoms for minute study, as a botanist selects certain types or species for examination. His societies include the orthodox Christian, Iranic and Arabic, Syriac, Indic, Sinic, Minoan, Sumeric, Hittite, Babylonic, Andean, Yucatec, Mexic, Mayan, and Egyptiac. These he classifies provisionally and primarily as wholly unrelated societies, societies unrelated to earlier societies, infra-affiliated societies, affiliated societies (subdivided), and supra-affiliated societies.

Anticipating the objection of critics that historical events are unique, Mr. Toynbee merely asks them "to agree with us that a given phenomenon may be unique and therefore incomparable in some respects, while at the same time in other respects it may be a member of a class and therefore comparable with other members of that class in so far as it is covered by the classification". He does not, however, meet the objection that no meaning can arise from such comparisons, even assuming that there are such "social atoms" or particularities as societies and classes of societies—an assumption based on a physical analogy.

Having selected his "social atoms" and made his classifications, Mr. Toynbee examines "the cause" of the "geneses" of civilizations, thus combining a physical and a biological analogy. He considers the ancient question of race and environment and finds no primordials here. Then he turns to the interrelations, to challenge and response, the stimulus of hard countries [Bodin!], of new ground, of blows, of pressures, and of penalizations. What outcome? "In scientific terminology, 'the most stimulating challenge is to be found in a mean between a deficiency of severity and an excess of it'. The meaning of this proposition has gradually unfolded itself in the long empirical process of proof. . . . What, then, is the movement towards which a nascent civilization is stimulated by the challenge that brings it to birth? Presumably the nascent civilization is stimulated to fulfill its nature. And what is it in the nature of a new born babe to do? When the babe has come to birth, it is in its nature to grow in wisdom and stature."

Having brought his "new born babes" or "social atoms" into being Mr. Toynbee examines their "growths". The criterion of growth is to be found in increasing command over human and physical environment, in a "transfer of energy, or shift of emphasis, from some lower sphere of being or sphere of action to a higher sphere"—a process which Mr. Toynbee calls "etherialization", and in "the transference of the field of action". All these generalizations are illustrated with amazing profusion by multitudinous citations drawn from the vast and imposing erudition of the author.

If at this stage of Mr. Toynbee's exploration and exposition, criticism were ventured by a reviewer of painfully limited knowledge it would be somewhat as follows. The introduction of analogies from biology and physics into historical thought (a practice which most of us are guilty of) does violence to the actuality of history and adds to confusion rather than to knowledge. Even the physical sciences start with some assumptions concerning the nature of things. Still more does any treatment of history. Empirical operations in history are always limited by the intellectual presuppositions of the author and there is no escape from this rule (Heussi, *Die Krisis des Historismus* and Th. Lessing, *Geschichte als Sinngebung des Sinnlosen*). Yet, such suggestions should be advanced merely as tentative, until Mr. Toynbee has completed his monumental labors.

New Milford. CHARLES A. BEARD.

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

A Biography of the Greek People. By CECIL FAIRFIELD LAVELL, Professor of the History of Thought in Grinnell College. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1934. Pp. xii, 297. $3.00.)

PROFESSOR Lavell has written a very attractive book about the ancient Greeks. His purpose, expressed in the preface, was to tell what these ancients did that permanently mattered: his hope, expressed in a sort of dedicatory letter, is that he has told what was worth telling. This purpose and hope tend to disarm unsympathetic criticism.

The chapters of this book which are historical in the ordinary sense, though they contain many penetrating and sound judgments, are not very good, because the author relies too much on the traditional literature and on certain modern scholars whom he considers dependable. In chapter I he regards the Homeric poems as presenting, on the whole, a uniform civilization. He is quite sure that there was a Minoan Empire and that Minos was a great king. He believes that the Greeks arrived from somewhere, not that they were produced by a fusion of races in Greece itself. In chapter II the account of the Hesiodic poetry is very good, although the *Book of Days* is regarded as a part of the *Works*. The description of life at Sparta is also good in the main. But the author does not seem to understand that it was Sparta's conquests in the eighth and seventh centuries which made Sparta what she was later. After the Messenian wars the Spartiatae, besides being a military caste, became country squires whose chief business was the management of the estates assigned to them. Chapter IV, "The War with Persia", is based on Herodotus and Mr. Grundy, and is the worst of all: it misconceives the situations and the strategy. Chapter VIII, "The Rise and Fall of the Athenian Empire", is not much better: it gives no adequate appreciation of the policy of Sparta after Platæa, the relations between Athens and her

"allies", the reasons for the cleft and bitterness between oligarchs and democrats in the various cities, or the underlying causes of the Peloponnesian War. On the other hand, there is much that is valuable even in the chapters devoted chiefly to political history, for example, the discussion of the degeneracy of the fourth century, and of the inherent defects of the city-state.

In the other chapters, V-VII, IX, XI, XIII-XV, Professor Lavell is on his own ground. There are some infelicitous statements, careless or exaggerated expressions; but on the whole the account of the development of religion, philosophy, literature, and art among the Greeks is acceptable. The author makes the great names seem important, even to college students, the ideas of the ancient Greek world comprehensible, reasonable, human. There is something unusually fresh and vivid about his presentation. To many readers he will make clear what perhaps they wished to know, but never understood before.

In spite, therefore, of serious faults, this is an admirable book. It tells a coherent and fascinating story about things which really matter.

Princeton University. WILLIAM KELLY PRENTICE.

Tiberio, successore di Augusto. Per EMANUELE CIACERI. (Rome: Albrighi, Segati and Company. 1934. Pp. xi, 335. 30 l.)

PROFESSOR Ciaceri marshals the results of his previous sound studies in the history of the later republic and early empire to the defense of Tiberius. In particular, he seeks to discredit the honesty and research ability of Tacitus, whom he regards far less favorably than would, for instance, Professor Marsh. In fact, he prefers the silence of earlier writers, as of Josephus and Philo with respect to Gaius's share in the death of Tiberius, to the statements of later ones, in this case Suetonius and Dio. Nevertheless, he accepts equally gossipy remarks by the later writers when they redound to his hero's credit. Apart, however, from this slight bias, his knowledge of the sources is wide and his use of them judicious.

With the assistance of recent Italian works on constitutional theory, Professor Ciaceri opens with a valuable analysis of the Augustan constitution, which he envisages as an infusion into the revived institutions and traditions of the republic of a monarchical element based on Cicero's concept of the *princeps*. In his discussion of the succession, though many would accept his view that Augustus meant the principate to be hereditary, few will agree with him in adopting Kornemann's thesis of a full coregency of Agrippa and Tiberius. He portrays Tiberius as a true Roman aristocrat, reserved, proud, and loyal. In line with his previous studies, he exonerates the emperor from responsibility for the abuse of *maiestas* and discounts most of the scandal about his relations with other members of the imperial family which Mr. Graves uses so freely in *I, Claudius*. He blames much of the trouble on

Agrippina and makes the interesting suggestion that Tiberius pursued her and Sejanus so bitterly because, as an old Roman, he felt an obligation of vendetta toward those who had played him false. His treatment of the dealings between Tiberius and the senate stresses the sincere effort made to foster senatorial government and the disappointment which resulted in the retirement to Capri. With the aid of Dr. Munthe, Professor Ciaceri sweeps away the miasmic traditions which have clustered about that island. Instead, he shows the aging ruler devoted to the cares of empire or, amid his scholars, to study and to the upbringing of Gaius, whom he regarded as a promising heir.

In the following points of detail, Professor Ciaceri's opinions will interest specialists: pp. 10–11, the *imperium maius* was not only retained but exercised within the *pomoerium;* p. 44, the sojourn in Rhodes was due to a dislike of Julia; p. 76, the concept of the emperor's *maiestas* was connected with his *sacrosanctitas;* p. 83, the *quaestio de maiestate* continued but lost importance under Tiberius; p. 188, Tiberius did not raise the *ducentesima* to a *centesima* tax; p. 212, n. 5, in 23 A. D., taxes were still collected by *publicani* and the change came only gradually thereafter; p. 254, n. 6, Tiberius did not command the death of Agrippa Postumus; p. 292, Sejanus may have revived the popular *comitia* for his election to the consulate in 30 A. D. (Dessau, *ILS.*, 6044). A final appendix disposes of Papini's revival of Tertullian's statement that Tiberius favored Christianity. The work is well written and cites passages from the ancient sources very fully. Modern works are, however, sparingly mentioned and there is no bibliography, despite the evidences of careful research throughout the book. The index comprises only proper names, not subjects.

For readers of English, this book challenges comparison with Professor Marsh's recent *Reign of Tiberius* (1931), to which Professor Ciaceri refers only rarely and slightingly. Nevertheless, there is little to choose between them. The Italian book is somewhat fuller in treatment and in the citation of ancient sources. But his use of the source material seems more extreme and arbitrary. Both scholars present substantially the same portrait of their hero and if some readers feel a sneaking hesitancy to accept this modern "reconstruction" of the traditional villain, let them remember how difficult it has been to rid American history of Parson Weems's opposite but equally one-sided portrayal of Washington.

Harvard University. MASON HAMMOND.

La renaissance du XII^e siècle: Les écoles et l'enseignement. Par G. PARÉ, A. BRUNET, P. TREMBLAY. Refonte complète de l'ouvrage de G. Robert (1909). [L'Institut d'études médiévales d'Ottawa, III.] (Paris: J. Vrin. 1933. Pp. 324.)

THE word renaissance is still with us. Its meaning varies; its exact connotation is frequently vague. Yet, as Professor Haskins stated some years ago, it is a term so convenient and so well established that if it had not existed we should have had to invent it. The authors of the present volume, well aware that they may offend some readers, are not loath to describe as a renaissance the age which gave birth to scholasticism and which witnessed the transformation of the political, economic, social, religious, and intellectual life of Western Europe. Their purpose has not been to produce a new work, but to revise thoroughly and completely the thesis of G. Robert, *Les écoles et l'enseignement de la théologie pendant la première moitié du XII^e siècle,* published in Paris in 1909 and now no longer available.

Since Robert's volume appeared much has been learned about the twelfth century—its life, its thought, its institutions. The present authors have mastered this new material and have incorporated the results of modern research in their work without entirely destroying Robert's earlier treatise. Planned on the model set by him and strictly adhering to this in many places the volume is, nevertheless, practically a new work. In many instances where he was perplexed, the later writers comprehend; where he was silent, they frequently inform. Such distinctions between the two works may easily be discerned by an examination of the sections dealing with Abelard's philosophical and theological writings.

The purpose of the book is to show clearly, step by step, the intellectual development of the twelfth century. In three introductory chapters, about one-third of the book, the authors describe the various centers of scholarly activity of the early Middle Ages, conditions prevailing in the schools, the subjects studied, and the methods of teaching that were customarily followed. The sections devoted to a discussion of the liberal arts are especially well done. Chapter IV, describing the renaissance of the twelfth century, gives a good account of the humanist John of Salisbury and of the great Bernard who dominated the century *"même humainement";* of the Cornifician utilitarians who, like modern sophomores eager to follow philosophy, were impatient of discipline in the arts; and of others who helped make the age brilliant. The second part of the book covers the teaching of theology. The treatment of the subject here is historical, rather than theological in character, and exegetical methods are traced from patristic times to the period when *Summae sententiarum* set the standards for theological studies. The authors emphasize, and rightfully so, the importance of personalities as interpreters of texts and as writers of original works, for the schools were lively places with keen minds ever alert.

There are short bibliographical notes appended to each chapter; however, the thorough documentation of the narrative directs readers to all the major works upon which the authors have relied. The bibliographies and notes are

especially helpful for references to books and articles recently published, even including many titles that appeared only a few weeks before the manuscript went to press. It is a pleasure to note the prominent place accorded the work of the late Professor Paetow. The authors have employed his *Guide to the Study of Medieval History* as he would have had it used; and his essays on the liberal arts, the schools, and medieval Latin receive proper recognition. There is an index for names; unfortunately, however, none has been provided for subjects. A real contribution, one not found in Robert's volume, is the lexicographical table. Semantic queries regarding many important and frequently used medieval Latin words may be conveniently answered by the references given in this list. There is also a brief introduction by M. C. Chenu.

Princeton University. GRAY C. BOYCE.

The Registrum Antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln. Edited by C. W. FOSTER, Canon of Lincoln and Prebendary of Leicester Saint Margaret. Volume II. [The Lincoln Record Society, Volume 28.] (Hereford: Hereford Times. 1933. Pp. xlviii, 403.)

WHEN the series of six volumes contemplated by the Lincoln Record Society under the very able editing of Canon Foster has been completed, the church of Lincoln will possess an unrivaled critical edition of its great collection of records, complete for all before the year 1235 and including many of later date. The third volume, the editor tells us, will contain charters of lands lying in general outside Lincolnshire; the fourth and fifth, Lincolnshire charters of the Common of the Canons, and the sixth, charters of the city of Lincoln, together with an epilogue which we shall eagerly anticipate since the great number of charters to be printed has made necessary the restriction of annotations and introductory remarks.

The general plan of the first volume (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVII, 534), has been continued in this, the second volume. A little less attention has been paid to the various readings of the manuscripts, in part because of the smaller number of original documents of the nature of royal charters. To meet a suggestion made with regard to the earlier volume, however, and to facilitate the work of students interested in the royal chancery, the editor has here included in an appendix facsimiles of twelve charters of Henry II which he had already printed, as well as facsimiles of documents contained in this volume. He has added also an appendix on seals, and at the beginning, a list of emendations and additions to the text of his earlier work. The second volume contains few documents that have been printed before; it is dedicated to Professor Stenton, and Mrs. Stenton has contributed the excellent subject index.

The charters and other documents are divided into those of early bishops and lay magnates, the oldest going back to Robert de Meulan in 1118, and

being supported by nearly forty other documents of the twelfth century and by a number of a somewhat later date. Other charters date back to Bishop Hugh II of the early thirteenth century, and to Bishops Robert Grosseteste, Henry Lexington, and Richard Gravesend. A group of twenty-three indulgences issued in favor of the church of Lincoln by various bishops of that church, and by others of places more remote, even of Moray and the Orkneys, remits penance of twenty or forty days to those that either go to Lincoln and listen to the sermons of the canons and members of the church, or say the *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria,* or contribute to the fabric fund by gift or legacy. A late document (1518) shows the city of Lincoln come to "such indigence and disaster" that special merits may be obtained by opening up the Foss Dyke and improving access to the city.

The most abundant information contained in the volume is probably that concerned with the administration of the lands of a great church and their distribution amongst various branches of the church's organization. A very interesting group of documents, for example, shows the provisions for the choristers made in 1264 by Bishop Richard Gravesend. Heretofore the boys had lived on the alms of canons; hereafter they are to be twelve in number; they are to be admitted by the dean and chapter; they are to dwell in one house under a master. They are there to receive definite revenue for their support, including pensions, money from chantries and obits, 18*d*. a week from the canons in turn for their week of ministration, and the *proventus ecclesiarum* of certain places—Ashby Puerorum, for example. An interesting note throws light on the Bible clerk, and our knowledge of the possible relations of mother churches and chapels, and the duties of various officials, clerks of the choir, chaplains of chantries, precentors, vicars choral, gains somewhat in precision.

Less information is given on agrarian matters. There are occasional suggestions of the two field system; of boon services; of bovates, and the exact content and situation of their component parts. There is frequent mention of villains; a grant of Henry II's reign of a serf with offspring and chattels, and a manumission of 1282. Some indication is given of certain procedures in the shire court, and of the relation of the itinerant justices to the liberties of Lincoln. In general, however, this volume is probably of greatest importance in the light it throws on ecclesiastical arrangements.

Mount Holyoke College. N. Neilson.

The Apostolic Camera and Scottish Benefices, 1418–1488. By Annie I. Cameron, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt., Diplômée of the Vatican in Palæography, Sometime Carnegie Research Fellow in History. [St. Andrews University Publications, No. XXXV.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1934. Pp. xciv, 478. $8.00.)

THIS is a calendar in English of the entries relating to Scotland from 1418 to 1488 in the principal series of cameral registers now extant in the Vatican Archives and the Archivio di Stato in Rome. The calendar is preceded by an introduction describing the central administration of *servitia* and annates and making brief allusions to other taxes and aspects of the papal financial system of the period. It contains much useful information which has not before been set forth in English and some which is entirely new. The illustrations drawn from the subsequent calendar are particularly valuable. The treatment does not represent a thorough study of all the literature and published sources available, and it sometimes displays signs of carelessness. There are several significant errors, such as the definition of annates as "payments made to the Curia by reason of papal provision to ecclesiastical benefices valued between 24 and 100 florins, gold of the Camera" (p. lxv), though several benefices noted in the following calendar as paying annates were valued at more than 100 florins, and the number could be multiplied from the entries relating to other countries. The minor mistakes run rather above the inevitable few. In this connection it may be noted that the important document quoted at page lxxi in note 3 as "from a note taken in Rome" is to be found in Archivio di Stato, Archivio Camerale 1862 (Quietanze 2), on the folio next preceding the index. The author is a little too prone to suggest hypotheses for which she establishes no high degree of probability. She points out, for example, that after 1475 in some of the registers the sum paid by a debtor is repeated in the margin at a larger figure than that given in the body of the entry, and infers the possibility that the difference represented interest paid by the debtors to the cameral bankers (pp. xxxiii-xxxv). She neglects to indicate that the sum in the entry is usually stated to be in gold florins of the camera, while that in the margin is entered only as florins, and she fails to establish any connection between interest and the difference.

The entries in the calendar are grouped according to the series of registers as they are now catalogued in the archives, though the plan has not been followed with entire consistency. The method is somewhat confusing, since this classification sometimes runs athwart the original contemporary classification. Among the Libri Quittanciarum, for example, are several registers which were originally Solutiones or Obligationes. It causes the more difficulty, because the editor supplies no adequate description of the nature of the different series. The Libri Quittanciarum, indeed, are ascribed to the wrong archives, unless they have been transferred from the Archivio di Stato to the Vatican since July 15, 1932. Moreover, the reader is left to conjecture just what registers have been used, since Dr. Cameron's two statements with regard to it (p.v) are very general and appear to conflict. Has she searched Archivio di Stato, Archivio Camerale, Conti Annuali del Tesoriere, nos. 8 and 15, which are contemporary Introitus and Exitus Registers, and Vatican

Archives, Introitus and Exitus Registers 389, 470, and 505, and Obligationes and Solutiones Registers 55A, 61, and 86 and found no items relating to Scotland, or has she overlooked them? To this and similar questions which might arise she gives no answer. Within each group the entries are presented in chronological order with a reference to the source which establishes the original order in the registers. It may be noted that among these references the abbreviation "C. S." is employed without explanation to designate the series of registers entitled Obligazioni per Servizi Comuni.

The summaries seem generally to be adequate. The only item of significance which is customarily omitted is the price charged for the letters of acquittance which is usually—though not always—noted in the registers. A comparison with extracts and photostats from the same registers relating to other countries indicates that this fundamental part of the work has been done much more carefully and accurately than the introduction and the critical apparatus. The calendar is consequently a contribution of prime importance for the understanding of many aspects of the papal relations with Scotland, and a noteworthy addition to the several collections of documents drawn from the records of the papal camera. A student who may wish to make a thorough study of such a subject as papal provisions, annates, or *servitia* in Scotland during the fifteenth century will still have to consult a few of the cameral manuscripts deposited in the Vatican Archives and the Archivio di Stato, but the amount of work which he will have to do in these archives will be much less than would have been necessary before the present book was published.

Haverford College. W. E. Lunt.

BOOKS OF MODERN HISTORY

Geschichte von Venedig. Von Heinrich Kretschmayr. Band III, *Der Niedergang.* [Allgemeine Staatengeschichte, herausgegeben von Hermann Oncken.] (Stuttgart: Friedrich Andreas Perthes. 1934. Pp. xv, 687. 24 M.)

The delay in the completion of this work—it is nineteen years since the appearance of the first volume—is explained by the circumstance that the finished first draft was destroyed in the burning of the Palace of Justice at Vienna on July 15, 1927. We are greatly indebted to Professor Kretschmayr for the undaunted courage with which he has surmounted that catastrophe and recreated this final volume. Scholars will find his survey their best introduction to Venetian history, at once a synthesis of past research and a guide for future study. It is well balanced in content, mature in its judgments, and supplemented with extremely useful bibliographical guides.

In this volume Professor Kretschmayr has consciously faced two main

problems, that of evaluating and illuminating the place of Venice in European culture during the three centuries in which her contributions to the fine arts were greatest, and that of explaining the character and causes of the decline of the Republic. The former task appears admirably done, and, on the whole, dominates the presentation. The division of the book into three main sections according to centuries corresponds to the cultural epochs, the Renaissance, the Baroque, and the Rococo. The author uses these divisions to characterize those stages of development of the European *Geist* which manifested themselves both in art and in social life and moral ideas. Noteworthy is the treatment of the Baroque as a distinct and positive phase. The painters and musicians receive most attention; their works are described with obvious love, and their importance is clarified by a free use of the comparative method and by a full statement of their relation to cognate developments elsewhere.

In the sections dealing with political and economic history Professor Kretschmayr writes as an expositor rather than as a narrator; his paragraphs generally explain and seldom depict. If the second theme of the book, the explanation of the decline, does not seem as satisfactorily presented as the evaluation of the cultural achievements, it is partly because the author has not succeeded in synthesizing with his excellent summary paragraphs the rather mechanically organized presentation of the details, but mainly because the author has not, in dealing with his second problem, made so free a use of the comparative method. The political impotence which overtook Venice would be more clearly understood were her fate more closely related to that of the other city-states or city leagues which attempted independent political life in the later Middle Ages, and her institutions studied against the background of those of the military monarchies with which she was unable to compete. Professor Kretschmayr threads his way carefully through the labyrinth of Venetian administrative magistracies—we note only his misconception of the functions of the *Magistrato alle legne*—but the enumeration leaves still unanswered many questions concerning the significance of the Venetian administrative system for the economic, financial, naval, and military strength of the Republic. On the other hand, the portrayal of the Venetian constitution in its relation to the structure of Venetian society leaves only a keen appetite for a more extensive narrative of the operation of the system than is permitted by the plan of this survey.

The scattered sections on Venetian economy arouse amazement at the extent to which the prosperity of the city survived after its original bases had been undermined. After her patricians had begun to withdraw from trade, after her political preëminence had passed, her relation to the network of European trade had altered, and her merchant marine had fallen behind competitors, she still maintained her prosperity until the end of the sixteenth

century, retaining her hold upon the central European markets and compensating by the expansion of her industry for what she had lost in no longer supplying the Western European markets with the products of the Far East. Only when the Dutch and English replaced the Portuguese and Spanish in the Indies and penetrated the Levant did Venice definitely lose her position as intermediary between East and West. There remained in the seventeenth century to support the pomp of Venetian life and the desperate fight against the Turk only that trade which came to Venice as Queen of the Adriatic, and the preëminence which many branches of Venetian manufactures still held in markets spread from England to Russia. During that century French competition deprived Venice of much of her industrial importance, and in the next century the disintegration of the metropolitan hegemony which Venice had long held over all the area about the head of the Adriatic was completed with the proclamation of the free ports of Trieste and Ancona. In view of that political weakness, inherent in her character as an armyless city-state overshadowed by the Ottoman Empire, which prevented Venice both from accepting the Spanish offer of 1586 to engage in ventures beyond the oceans and from affirming by force of arms a superior commercial position in the Levant or even in the Adriatic, the road to comparative prosperity for the later days of the Republic lay through fostering the industrial and agricultural development of her dominions on the mainland. But during the last century and a half of their independent existence the Venetians did not make the most even of those economic opportunities which their political impotence left to them. At the conclusion of the story one may still feel, with due recognition of all the difficulties created by external circumstance, that the character of the Venetian aristocracy in large measure determined the fate of Venice, that the change therein from political vigor and economic initiative to political make-believe and economic ineffectiveness resulted from the operation of some principle embedded in the very nature of that aristocracy.

The Johns Hopkins University. FREDERIC CHAPIN LANE.

Der deutsche Bauernkrieg. Von GÜNTHER FRANZ. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg. 1933. Pp. xiii, 494. 17 M.)

A comprehensive history of the German Peasants' War has long been needed. It is nearly a century now since the last and that a very biased and unsatisfactory attempt was made in W. Zimmermann's *Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges* to write the history of the whole movement. In recent years innumerable theses and monographs have brought new light to bear on the details of that momentous event, but it has remained for Dr. Franz to gather this scattered material together, supplemented by the results of his own extensive research in the German archives, and to present a complete and rational picture of the revolt in all parts of Germany.

The Peasants' War has always attracted the interest of historians of the sixteenth century, not only as an important phase of the social and economic history of Germany, but also because of its rather ambiguous connection with the Lutheran Reformation. No one of the doubtful points that have vexed historians in their interpretation of the Peasants' War has caused more controversy than this. It was, no doubt, partly with this in mind that the author devotes nearly 150 pages of his book to a careful analysis of the earlier peasant risings, which prepared the way for the great revolt of 1525. In many respects this long introduction is the most interesting portion of the work. After a brief note on the signs of similar unrest in the lands outside Germany, the risings in Flanders, the Jacquerie, and the English Peasants' Revolt, Dr. Franz proceeds to trace the history of a long series of isolated protests and revolts in Germany, extending over a period of two centuries and finding expression in a variety of demands, all of which were gathered together and strengthened in the general rising of the sixteenth century.

That the last great revolt of the German peasants was but the culminating outbreak after a long period of discontent will not be regarded as news, any more than will the statement that Luther's declaration of the supreme authority of the Bible and of the right of every layman to find truth in it for himself exerted a profound influence on the thought of the peasants in 1525. What Dr. Franz does show, however, a little more clearly than most past historians, is the development of social theories among common men prior to the Reformation, and the manner in which the evangelical doctrine worked upon them. He finds that all previous risings can be divided into two distinct groups, according to the type of demands made and the rights to which the peasants appealed for justification. He lists these earlier revolts under two headings, "der Kampf um das alte Recht" and "der Kampf um das Göttliche Recht", the former reactionary, the latter revolutionary in character. The two types of revolt, the one based on an appeal to ancient rights and customs against new laws or the heavier burdens imposed upon the peasants by individual lay and clerical lords, the other based on a rather vague appeal to divine law against all serfdom and social inequality, remained separate and resulted only in brief isolated risings until they were amalgamated in the general revolt of the Peasants' War. For neither the citing of old customs against specific local abuses nor the unauthoritative "Göttliche Recht" provided a broad or firm enough foundation for a nation-wide rebellion. That foundation was furnished for the first time by the adoption of the Bible as the authority for a new social doctrine that could be made to cover all demands and give ample justification for all grievances. It was Luther's Bible more than Luther, the Scriptures more than the Reformation that welded isolated risings into one great revolution.

Yet, despite the general adherence to the evangelical authority, there was

little real unity in the peasants' ranks. Dr. Franz finds in their lack of common aims and united leadership one of the principal causes for the failure of the peasants at a time when victory seemed within their grasp. Throughout the war each district acted independently of the rest. The author has therefore traced the course of the war in detail in one section of the country after another, rather than as a whole. Because of local differences, it is difficult to draw general conclusions on many controversial points. As to the question whether the condition of the peasants was actually becoming worse in the period before the revolt, Dr. Franz admits the difficulty of finding adequate statistics to serve as the basis for an authoritative statement, but adds, reasonably enough, that for the motives of the revolt this is less important than the opinion of the peasants themselves regarding their state. On the whole he seems to think that the German peasants were more prosperous than before, but that in a great many places in recent years new laws, new taxes, and stricter enforcement of feudal dues had served to exasperate them. There is also proof that a good many lords were reducing their free tenants to a state of serfdom.

Dr. Franz gives by far the largest share of his attention to the rural aspects of the revolt. In doing so, he probably slights unduly the part played by the urban classes in the war. It is his opinion that the townspeople, save in the smallest towns that were little more than country villages, never really made common cause with the rustic peasants. When they did join the peasant movement it was to take advantage of it for immediate purposes of their own.

On numerous small points of fact, matters of time, place, and personality, Dr. Franz disagrees with earlier writers, frequently citing manuscript sources that are not available to the general reader. The usefulness of his work will be considerably enhanced by the publication of his collection of *Akten zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges*. The present volume is copiously annotated and delightfully illustrated with reproductions of contemporary pictures.

New York University. WALLACE K. FERGUSON.

American Treasure and the Price Revolution in Spain, 1501–1650. By EARL J. HAMILTON, Ph. D., Professor of Economics in Duke University. [Harvard Economic Studies.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1934. Pp. xxxv, 428. $4.50.)

ONE of the outstanding features of this thoroughgoing study is its present timeliness. Sixteenth century Spain may seem remote, indeed, from the hectic days of the New Deal, but it would be difficult to imagine a more immediately pertinent historical volume of any description than this erudite compilation of the interrelationship of the movements of precious metals and prices during an era when Spanish ascendancy in the world's economic

affairs was, if anything, even more outstanding than that of the United States to-day.

The purpose of the volume is, briefly, to measure the effect of the movements of precious metals upon the variations of prices and to establish more particularly their time sequence, the classification of commodities most involved, the efforts made to control these price variations, and the after effects of the whole episode. Each of these objectives has been attained by the author in truly scholarly fashion.

The work is divided into three parts. The first is an analysis of the gold and silver movements from America and within the Peninsula. On the latter point particular attention is paid to Castile and Valencia with relatively little space devoted to Aragon and Catalonia. Doubtless in Dr. Hamilton's later contributions on the subject we shall have more on the price reactions in that very important industrial and commercial corner of Spain. The second part comprises an exhaustive record of the source materials on the price revolution presented in three 50-year periods for the years covered by the volume, 1501–1650. An interesting analysis is presented of the reactions of particular commodities in the course of the price upheaval. The data regarding wages, both real and money, are especially significant in the light of experience in other lands and other times during similar monetary distortions. The third part consists of fully detailed appendixes on the methods of compensation, with a voluminous series of calculations of grain prices, money wages, and other important topics.

The source tabulations are truly extraordinary in their diversity and present impressive evidence of the zeal of the author. A most extensive search was made, not simply in the national archives in the capital and other large cities, but in scores of other localities. Account books were ransacked in all parts of the Peninsula—those of hospitals, convents, colleges, orphanages, municipalities, gilds, etc. One suggestion for further source material, if more were necessary, would be the records of a few of the older noble families, such as those of the houses of Bejar and Acuña, which are still available. But it must frankly be doubted whether any material of this category would supply more than additional confirmation of the conclusions based upon the formidable masses of first-hand information already tabulated.

One of the most interesting sections of the book comprises a study of the contemporary views as to why prices rose. These particular pages are especially worthy of attention in the light of current opinion of the factors affecting price changes. The sixteenth century Spaniard was almost entirely ignorant of the relations of the treasure influx to price increases. The New World was charged with a certain responsibility for price changes, due chiefly to its imports of vast quantities of provisions and supplies from the mother country. The earliest indication of an appreciation of the relationship be-

tween treasure imports and Spanish price changes was in the manuscript pages of Gómara's *Annals of the Emperor Charles V*, written in 1558 and first published by Professor Merriman in 1911. Bodin's treatise written some ten years later made a more elaborate reference to this subject, but not until the opening of the seventeenth century was there any considerable discussion in print among Spanish economists of the tie between treasure importations and price changes.

One interesting bit of evidence of the relationship between the two was the gradual spread of the increased prices northward from Seville which was the center for American imports. Dr. Hamilton traces with convincing details the gradual northward flow of the price advance and points out the factors involved in the movement including, among other influences, the annual nation-wide migrations of the flocks of the Mesta. As further evidence of the bearing of the gold and silver influx upon prices, he cites the close coördination of the year-by-year increase of these shipments and the advance of prices in specific commodities and localities.

Only during the opening decades of the sixteenth century did the influence of the gold and silver importations play a secondary part as a price influence, being outranked in those years by the heavy colonial demand for merchandise, the rapid expansion of credit facilities, and the increase in the output of the German and Hungarian silver mines. Treasure importations began to take preëminence as an influence in the price field by the early 1530's even before the opening up of the wealth of Peru.

Dr. Hamilton makes a valuable contribution in his analysis of the quantity theory of money through carefully detailed evidence of the growing velocity of circulation. His regional and commodity analysis of this phase of the problem is especially illuminating. He has, furthermore, made careful allowances for the use of gold and silver in the arts, especially for ecclesiastical purposes, and the flow of metals from Europe to the East—that "necropolis of precious metals".

Dr. Hamilton's contribution upon the part played by wage changes throughout the episode is most timely, particularly with reference to the current situation. The lack of wage and salary adjustments was in those days, as at present, a major cause for grave social agitation.

New York City. JULIUS KLEIN.

The Letters of Stephen Gardiner. Edited by JAMES ARTHUR MULLER, Ph. D., Professor of Modern Church History, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. xxxviii, 573. $10.50.)

EIGHT years ago Professor Muller published in an appendix to his biography of Gardiner (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXII, 102) a calendar of all of Gardiner's

letters which he was able to find. His search for them was very careful and extended not only to public and private collections in England but to Continental archives as well. Altogether he located 112 original letters and copies of sixty-one others of which the originals are missing. He now prints these letters in full, *verbatim et literatim,* with explanatory notes. His editorial work bears every evidence of careful scholarship, and we may safely accept his texts as definitive. It is to be hoped, however, that in course of time more of Gardiner's letters will come to light. There must have been many more written, for he occupied important public offices for nearly twenty years, he was hard-working, and he dearly loved to write. The lacunæ are obvious enough. For example, we have only thirty-nine letters to show for Gardiner's five-year term as principal secretary to Henry VIII, only nine to show for his three years as ambassador to France, only fifteen (of which only five deal with political questions) for the whole of his public life in Mary's reign. It is not nearly enough, not so many as any one of Elizabeth's diligent secretaries wrote in a single year. But there are still vast treasuries of uncatalogued or very inadequately catalogued collections of manuscripts in English private hands. So we are permitted to hope that much of what seems to be lost of Stephen Gardiner is merely not quite irretrievably buried.

There is not much that is new in Professor Muller's collection. Of Gardiner's extant letters written during the reign of Henry VIII (114 all told), all but eleven have been calendared in *Letters and Papers . . . of the Reign of Henry VIII,* and of these eleven all but one have been printed elsewhere. Of those preserved from Edward VI's reign (forty all told), sixteen are printed by Foxe in his *Actes and Monuments.* It is worth noting, by the way, that where Foxe's texts can be checked from the manuscripts they prove to be accurate. The fiery Protestant, much as he hated Gardiner, took no liberties with his letters. Perhaps the most valuable of the material not heretofore printed are the ten letters (written in 1547–1548) from a volume of transcripts in the British Museum (Additional MSS., 28571). Those preserved from Mary's reign have chiefly to do with the affairs of Cambridge University and add nothing to our knowledge of the momentous problems which Gardiner had to face during the last two years of his life.

The great value of the collection is in the picture it gives of the man himself and for which no calendared version of his writings will suffice. Gardiner was not only the last of the great ecclesiastical statesmen, he was also the last of the great Humanists in high public office. If he attaches on the one hand to Wolsey, he attaches very definitely on the other to Sir Thomas More. He was a learned doctor, a clever diplomatist, a hard-working public servant, but he was also a very witty, passionate, lovable human being. And he was all of these things at once—so much so that the whole man is never lost in the ecclesiastic or the statesman and will out even in his most official and con-

ventional writings. On that account his dispatches merely as reading matter are about the best we have for the sixteenth century. Compared with them those of Wolsey and Cromwell, Cecil and Walsingham are dull and colorless documents. Most of us have allowed John Foxe, the martyrologist, to form our opinion of Stephen Gardiner. His own letters are the best corrective. After the reading of them we may quite possibly conclude that his own estimate of himself was not so far wrong: "Although I go not about", he wrote in 1545, "to prove myself a saint, for I have made no such outward visage of hypocrisy, yet it shall appear I am not utterly a devil."

The University of Pennsylvania. CONYERS READ.

Correspondentie van Willem den Eerste, Prins van Oranje. Uitgegeven door DR. N. JAPIKSE. Deel I, *1551–1561*. [Koninklijk Huis-Archief.] (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1934. Pp. xxix, 417. 7.50 Gld.)

ONE would surmise that after the publication of eight bulky volumes by G. Groen van Prinsterer (*Archives ou correspondance inédite de la maison d'Orange-Nassau,* first series, covering the period from 1552 to 1584) and six venerable tomes by L. P. Gachard (*Correspondance de Guillaume le Taciturne*) there would be no need of another set of books containing newly discovered letters of William the Silent. But it so happened that 3600 letters had escaped the attention of the two older archivists. Although Gachard did discover about 400 epistles after he had published his own edition, bringing the total of unpublished correspondence up to the 4000 mark, he merely considered further publication. Dr. Japikse found a note by Gachard referring to these 400 letters, and published it in the volume now under discussion (p. xxix). He added the remark that it will be impossible for him to give to the public all the unpublished material now at his disposal. He must confine himself to the more important letters, and obviously, he cannot include any documents except letters written by William of Orange himself and those addressed to him personally.

Nevertheless, we are very grateful to those who made it possible for Dr. Japikse to carry out a plan that is ambitious enough. In his first volume he edits 338 letters, covering the years 1551-1561. Only a few of these have been published before, for it has been the aim of the editor to publish anew only those epistles that help the reader understand the new material and those which have not been adequately or accurately edited before. The new set is not therefore intended to supersede the series of the two editors mentioned above. There can be no question, however, about the superiority of the present series. Not only has Dr. Japikse covered a large number of archives in the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, France, Spain, England, and Italy; but he has also taken advantage of numerous facilities that were not offered to his predecessors.

The letters have not been arranged in a strictly chronological order, except in so far as the period from 1551 to 1561 has been divided into three epochs: (1) to the abdication of Charles V, (2) to the departure of Philip II, (3) to the second marriage of William the Silent. The editor argues with no small degree of plausibility that the reader will be aided by the manner in which the letters have all been carefully grouped together under the heading of a related subject, like that of the possessions of the prince, his relations to the government in the Low Countries, and his second marriage. At the end of the volume there is a chronological list of all the letters for the aid of those who miss the arrangement so familiar to them in other collections. Perhaps it might not have been too much to expect to find in this list a complete reference to all the letters published elsewhere, as well as to all the letters that still remain unpublished. Some scholars will demand the right to know just what has been omitted.

The editor readily admits that the new material published by him for the first time does not make the prince appear in an entirely different light from that seen before by others. On the other hand there are phases in his character and events in his life which have never before been properly elucidated. Among these are the management of his enormous domains, particularly in this early period, and his relations with the nobility in the Low Countries and with a number of German, French, and Italian princes. On pages 158–169, for example, we find letters addressed to the Count of Schwarzburg, the Count of Brunswick, and the King of Denmark; and epistles from the Count of Hessen, the Count of Mansfeld, the Duke of Orleans-Longueville, and Cosimo de' Medici, duke of Florence. Judging from the outlandish spelling in some of the German and French letters, we can readily conclude that Dr. Japikse deserves much credit for this splendid edition. Our only regret is that this first volume appears to have been rushed somewhat hurriedly through the press. There is an unnecessary typographical error on page 393, and in the copy used by the reviewer pages 370–371, 374–375, 378–379, and 382–383 are blank.

The University of Michigan. A. Hyma.

The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and in the New. By Roger Bigelow Merriman, Gurney Professor of History and Political Science in Harvard University. Volume IV, *Philip the Prudent.* (New York: Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. xxiv, 780. $7.50.)

Sixteen years after the publication of the first two volumes, and nine years after the publication of the third, Professor Merriman has completed his great work. Far from showing any signs of fatigue as he approached his goal, he has surpassed even the high standard set by his earlier books. The new volume is as judicious, as careful, as thorough, and as well written as the

earlier ones, and, more than they, it has been based on manuscripts and has added more to the fund of historical fact accessible to the public. In order to fortify his conclusions, Professor Merriman has prepared for the press a collection of unpublished material, drawn from the archives of Spain, France, and England. It is to be hoped that he will not overlook American collections. The Dreer Library in Philadelphia possesses at least two letters of Philip, and several others pertinent to his reign; there are also some manuscripts in the Spanish Museum in New York. The late Paul van Dyke collected three hundred unpublished letters of Catherine de Médicis which would surely contain much of interest for the biographer of Philip II. If these cannot find an editor, may they at least be put at the disposal of those scholars who can use them.

Probably the portrait of Philip still current in England and America is the savagely partisan Protestant caricature put into circulation by Motley and Froude. With his fatal command of superlative Macaulay declared that Philip II furnished the best example in all history of how not to govern. Prescott took up the subject when his powers were failing and produced nothing worthy of his great achievements in earlier periods of Spanish history. Long before he wrote, Ranke had laid the foundation of serious and unbiased research in his work on *Die Osmanen und die spanische Monarchie* (1827). In the last century a number of writers have labored successfully in the field. By a curious coincidence no less than four biographies of Philip, besides the one now under review, have recently appeared. One of them, by Mariéjol, is by a great authority on French history in the sixteenth century; but all of them are much too kind to their hero, who is represented as the first modern king, a doughty champion of religion, a great statesman, and an enlightened patriot.

Now at last we have a history of an important reign as solidly based as it is judicious. Sacrificing picturesque detail to a just presentation of the subject as a whole, the author has enhanced the value of his book for the philosophic historian while diminishing its appeal to the general reader. In the main, the writer's interest is political. Some attention is given to religion, and a little to economics, to art, to education, and to literature; but the bulk of the work is devoted to an elucidation of Spain's foreign and colonial policy. Pfandl's *Spanische Kultur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts,* apparently not used by Professor Merriman, will supplement him. Notwithstanding strong bias and an outrageous attack on Henry Charles Lea, Pflandl cannot be safely neglected by any student of Spanish intellectual history.

In the first chapter Professor Merriman, while eschewing the violent chiaroscuro of previous biographers, paints a life-like picture of the king. In the heritage from his ancestors and in the manner of his education were laid the foundations of Philip's character, his devotion to the Church, his defective linguistic equipment, his joylessness, his love of books and of art,

his industry, and above all his prudence. His conspicuous merits, simplicity and love of justice, were offset by a determination to keep in his own hands the guidance of every department of his government. The resulting centralization overburdened him and badly hampered the efficiency of his officers. For the public calamities of his reign he is thus to some extent held responsible; but he is acquitted of all fault in the private tragedies that darkened his life.

In succeeding chapters the author tells of the persecution of heretics and of Moriscos, of "the last crusade" against the Turks, of the Spanish colonies, of the annexation of Portugal, and of the wars with France, England, and the revolting Netherlands. The key to Spain's foreign policy, and the secret of her final defeat, is found largely in the Dutch revolt. But the crowning catastrophe was of course the destruction of the Armada, on which our author throws much new light. He shows, for example, that the preponderance of the Spanish ships in tonnage has been much exaggerated, and that the tactics and formation of the Spanish fleet have been misunderstood by previous historians.

A final chapter considers the causes of the decay of the Spanish empire. The first and principal cause of weakness is found in the accidental and artificial character of its growth. In joining Castile and Aragon two divergent currents were forced to flow together in an unnatural union. The empire of Aragon lay in the Mediterranean; that of Castile beyond the Atlantic. The accession of the Hapsburg dominions brought in another element of discord that finally proved incompatible with Hispanic interests. Lastly, the annexation of Portugal added still another insoluble problem to the task of the ruler. On the other hand the Indies, in the author's judgment, proved to be not the "white elephant" that some historians have declared them to be, but a main source of Spanish strength and a great glory to her civilization.

A second cause of weakness lay in the antiquated ideals and practices of the government. Persecution, bigotry, and religious war drained the state of resources already undermined by unsound economic policies. To the Catholic Church Spain sacrificed her material interests. Nor did she, by her war on Protestant and Mohammedan, win much favor from the papacy. There was always going on under the surface a struggle of king and pope, the former supported by the Inquisition, the latter by the Jesuit order. Unwieldy size, a bad fiscal policy, and the rise of a new religion are among the causes most commonly assigned for the fall of Rome. It will instruct and interest the philosophic historian to compare Montesquieu's great essay on that subject with Professor Merriman's chapter on the fall of Spain. The final impression of a reader of this truly splendid work is that the author is almost too cautious in speculation. His outstanding merit is the accumulation, sifting, and lucid exposition of a large body of freshly discovered facts.

Cornell University. PRESERVED SMITH.

Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism: a Criticism of Max Weber and his School. By H. M. Robertson, Ph. D., Senior Lecturer in Economics in the University of Cape Town. [Cambridge Studies in Economic History, General Editor, J. H. Clapham.] (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. xvi, 223. $3.50.)

The Economic Morals of the Jesuits: an Answer to Dr. H. M. Robertson. By J. Brodrick, S. J. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1934. Pp. 158. $2.25.)

Dr. Robertson, disregarding the fact that the question has been considerably changed since 1903 by Tawney and Sombart, devotes a whole book to refuting Weber's doctrine that Calvinism and Puritanism had some causal or genetic relation to capitalism. His method is to show, (1) that many Calvinist and Puritan writers and preachers condemned usury, (2) that many Jesuits approved usury, and (3) that capitalism was really the result of the discoveries and the consequent expansion of trade in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

"Because he loves the Society of Jesus with all his heart", Father Brodrick, harnessing his immense learning in the field of Jesuit history to the lowly task of controversy, wrote a completely destructive review of the part of Dr. Robertson's book that concerns the Jesuits. He shows by means of specific quotation that Dr. Robertson took his Jesuit history largely from the writings of their Jansenist enemies and that when he used Jesuit sources he generally garbled the quotations. If controversy is to become a part of our American life of learning, Father Brodrick's book, for its manners, method and substance, should be presented to classes in historical method as a model.

In his brief interpretation of Pascal and of the whole Jansenist-Jesuit conflict, Father Brodrick rises to values far above that of the controversial issue. Good Catholic and good Jesuit, he only falls short of appreciating the relevant positive aspect of Jansenism, the assertion of the irreducible and unqualified responsibility of the individual conscience as against the social discipline of the confessional. Here in this attitude, which had so many manifestations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—Jansenism, Quietism, Pietism, Methodism, Quakerism—is a phenomenon of a different order from that of this controversy, not to be formulated merely out of the words of preachers, which seems to link together in a relation not necessarily causal the new tendencies of economic and religious life. At this level, the oppositions of religious parties become, like sex among modern physiologists, a matter of degree rather than of kind and we are under the necessity of observing the Protestantism of Catholics and the Catholicism of Protestants.

The first part of Dr. Robertson's book does not carry us beyond the con-

clusions of Tawney although he does show more fully that the Puritan preachers were not so advanced as their congregations. In the final chapter, he concludes that "it seems likely that the expansion of trade in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans was a prime cause [*sic*] of the growth of economic individualism in Western Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries". Nevertheless, he has gathered together in his book a considerable mass of interesting erudition. Less brashly exploited, it might have had more significance. Certainly the "lag" between the opinions of preachers and the attitudes of laymen has significant relevance to the decadence of Puritanism in eighteenth century England. The discussion of the discoveries and the growth of oceanic commerce, if it had not been vitiated by Dr. Robertson's passion for the "prime cause", might have been made into a valuable exposition of that phase of capitalistic life.

The University of Wyoming. F. L. Nussbaum.

Friedrich der Grosse: Entwicklungsgeschichte eines Staatsmannes. Von Arnold Berney. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 1934. Pp. v, 363. 14 M.)

Undeterred by a long line of predecessors, including such historians as Lavisse, Paul Dubois, Reinhold Koser, and, perhaps, spurred on by the imaginative perversions of recent literary biographers, Dr. Berney has once again made the great Prussion monarch the object of a special inquiry and produced, let it be said at once, a very creditable volume. It is a thorough study of solid erudition, essential sanity of judgment, carefully and accurately documented, a thoughtful and courageous book which will be welcomed by historical students everywhere. The author writes from a point of view that is neither strictly Prussian nor Austrian and is as far removed from nationalistic glorification as from malicious denigration. This volume pretends to be neither a biography nor a history of Prussia under Frederick II; it is devoted to but a single theme, the education or the evolution of the statesman, but his treatment of this theme is so comprehensive that his study constitutes an important contribution to both. With this as his principal interest Dr. Berney carries the narrative to the point when he regards the monarch as having fully matured, to 1755, stopping just short of the Seven Years War. It might be urged that such a division is more applicable to the intellectual history and diplomacy of Frederick II than to Frederick the economist, but this does not detract from the value of this excellent volume. Of conspicuous interest to the professional historian is the severe method which this student of Georg von Below employs in his study, the use of none but exclusively contemporary sources, the rigid abstention from all systematic construction, the strict avoidance of generalizations based on statements and policies of various periods of Frederick's lifetime and reduced to a system which would be a mere

conception of the mind to Dr. Berney and would correspond precisely to no period of so long a reign. Whatever else might be said in defense of such a method as applied to social or constitutional history, Dr. Berney's method is admirably suited to the subject in hand. It is difficult to follow consistently and its results are not always spectacular, but it facilitates accuracy and in this case has produced an honest historical inquiry in the best sense.

The volume falls roughly into three principal divisions: the crown prince before his accession to the throne in 1740, the diplomacy and warfare of the king to 1755, and finally his domestic policy topped off with a concluding chapter on the matured monarch. Although the youth of Frederick II has been worked over frequently before, this section of Dr. Berney's study is especially felicitous. There emerges a crown prince imbued with the moralism and idealism of the early French Enlightenment, but a young man, who, because of the discipline imposed by his father and his exclusion from public affairs, was lamentably ignorant of Prussia and its peculiar problems and immature in his political judgments, notwithstanding occasional evidence of unusual political intelligence. The glaring inconsistencies of the two youthful pamphlets of Frederick, the *Considérations* and the *Antimachiavel,* are scored up against his immaturity. Even the first Silesian War is pronounced the adventure of an immature statesman. It was rather in the nature of a "brilliant improvisation" than the result of long and careful planning, the question of the legality of his claims to Silesia arising a week after the announcement of his plan of conquest (p. 122). During the first weeks of the war the author finds that Frederick pendulated uncertainly between his own rash projects and those of his Minister Podewils to whom he yielded again and again, that he misjudged the character not only of Maria Theresa but of George II of England. It is generally the belief of the author that Frederick the Great was relatively late in maturing not only as a diplomat but as a general. It should be mentioned, in passing, that the chapter on Frederick's relation to the Empire contains a fund of new material. Perhaps the happiest sections of the book are those devoted to Frederick's diplomacy between 1749 and 1755 before the Reversal of Alliances when his French alliance dominated his foreign policy. These sections are fairly packed with acute observation and close, penetrating analysis. Beside these passages the chapter on Frederick's domestic policy appears less impressive, though certainly adequate.

The Ohio State University. WALTER L. DORN.

Le Directoire, du 11 brumaire an IV au 18 fructidor an V. Par ALBERT MATHIEZ. Publié, d'après les manuscrits de l'auteur, par Jacques Godechot, agrégé de l'Université. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1934. Pp. vii, 390. 30 fr.)

THIS posthumous volume of Albert Mathiez, conscientiously edited by M. Godechot from both the published and manuscript sources of the author, makes us realize more than ever the enormous loss to scholarship in his premature death. While there is comparatively little factual information in it that is altogether new, in most instances Mathiez's own spade work in the archives, in contemporary newspapers, and in the memoirs gives to his restatement of the facts an illuminating freshness and a persuasiveness that all but makes them his own contribution. But above all what gives this thorough study of the men, the methods, and the policies of the early Directory its great value was Mathiez's unsurpassed talent for synthesis. In themselves the thousand and one detailed bits of information which he handles would bewilder even the most attentive and resolute reader (and even under his sure and skillful manipulation it is difficult to assimilate them all), but to Mathiez obviously they were no cause for dismay. For him they were no isolated and incoherent odds and ends of a puzzle; for him they fitted neatly into a logical pattern, whose every tracery he drew now patiently, now more truculently, but always clearly and with his characteristic vigor of expression.

One may choose, with Meynier and other students, to treat the years from 1795 to 1799 as a period of superficial violence but basic recuperation, of spectacular if minor plots and coups but gradual restoration of order. This realistic interpretation, along with its other merits, has the virtue of making understandable the success of Napoleon's rapid reforms during the Consulate. Mathiez nowhere denies the validity of this interpretation; he ignores it precisely because it was so obviously true. For him the Directory was the denial and the betrayal of revolutionary idealism. His distrust of the bourgeois national state of the nineteenth century was so deep-rooted and his instinctive advocacy of the claims of the disinherited of the earth so compelling that he had no choice but to show the broader social significance and therefore the seamier side of that recuperation and that restoration of law and order.

He characterizes the régime of the Directory as the continuation of revolutionary dictatorship by the rump of professional politicians—the regicides and the Thermidorians—whose struggle to maintain themselves in power meant little or nothing at all to a resigned, indifferent, disgusted, or cowed people, whose supporters and opponents alike were few in number and fighting not for ideals but for special interests of a personal or class order. The degradation of dictatorship, that dictatorship which began constitutionally with the Constituent Assembly and continued illegally but memorably with the Montagnards, is the theme of the first four chapters which deal with the administrative methods, the personnel of the central government, and the problems of local administration in their setting of the unliquidated crisis of 1795. In the next two chapters his examination of the financial policy and the relationship between business and politics reveals little that Debidour

and Marion had not already shown, but the emphasis upon the social significance of chattelizing the Republic to the financial and military interests is unmistakably his own. With the following three chapters Mathiez descends into the teeming little world of embittered intriguers and futile plotters, inchoate idealists, and rancorous officials which constituted the Babouvist conspiracy, giving us what is unquestionably the most penetrating and illuminating examination of that movement that has yet been written. The last five chapters trace in careful, almost exhaustive, detail the *politique de ralliement* which the government adopted after suppressing the "Conspiracy of the Equals". He shows how this policy eventuated first, in the constitutional victory of the royalists in the elections of the year V—and again his emphasis is upon the social rather than the political aspirations of the victors—and secondly, in the government's counter-thrust against them in the coup of the 18th Fructidor, a thrust decisive in saving the Republic from the royalists and in delivering it to the tender mercies of the generals.

Mathiez lives in these pages, in his strength and in his weakness. All praise and thanks are due to M. Jacques Godechot for his faithful commemoration of the ideas and the language of his remarkable teacher and friend.

Long Island University. LEO GERSHOY.

Economics and Liberalism in the Risorgimento: a Study of Nationalism in Lombardy, 1814–1848. By KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD, Department of History, The Johns Hopkins University. [The Johns Hopkins Historical Publications.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1934. Pp. xiv, 365. $3.00.)

EVERY student of the Italian Risorgimento will recognize Professor Greenfield's volume as a pioneer work of prime importance and a model for what ought to be done for other Italian provinces. When one attempts to reconstitute from available books on the Risorgimento the actual social and economic conditions of Italy in the first half of the nineteenth century, in order to evaluate the diplomatic maneuvers of Cavour or the mystical apostolate of Mazzini, it is amazingly difficult to find anything substantial. Professor Greenfield has culled from manuscript and newspaper collections material that is both highly substantial and unfailingly relevant. There is scarcely a page of his absorbing study that does not illuminate the actions and motives of the Cavours, Mazzinis, Garibaldis, and their followers through the epos of Italian unification.

Lombardy during the period of this study presents a conservative, agricultural society, with only a primitive credit machinery; a population denser than that of any other European country save Belgium; a mercantile element somewhat slow to comprehend the anxiety of its leaders that Italy should take

advantage of the fact that once more the Indian trade was to pass through the Mediterranean instead of around the Cape; and a nascent industrialism composed of a declining metallurgical industry, relatively stationary woolen and linen industries, and a rapidly expanding manufacture of silk and cotton. Less industrialized than England, Belgium, France, Switzerland, or even some other parts of the Austrian Empire, Lombardy was nevertheless slowly acquiring the problems and solutions of an industrial society. Professor Greenfield wisely points out how subtly this process was drawing Lombardy into the orbit of West-European society and away from the Metternichian concepts of Central Europe. He makes it clear that the liberal journalists were aware of this reorientation and worked to expedite it. As Austrian subjects with no faith in Mazzinian insurrection, they labored to promote through their journals a public opinion and institutions that would eventually render Italian independence and unity obvious necessities. They backed popular education, economic laissez faire, scientific agriculture, commercial and industrial expansion. They taught their readers throughout Italy to think of Italy as an economic entity. They thereby rendered Austrian domination steadily more inapposite, more irrational. Under the leadership of Romagnosi they put Italians through that course of "therapeutic education" without which he did not believe they could become mature enough to use the ends for which Mazzini agitated. With one eye on the Austrian censorship they developed an ingenious use of statistics as a cipher code and as symbols of nationalist aspirations. They created the public that rallied to the banners of Balbo, of Gioberti, of D'Azeglio. In short, they carried on what D'Azeglio called a "conspiracy in open daylight".

Professor Greenfield has shown great historical imagination in interpreting the symbols of a movement that was primarily a movement of opinion. He notes that in the dark days of Metternich gas illumination shed a radiance not wholly physical in nature. He notes the popularity in Lombardy of "Lancastrian" schools, schools of mutual instruction but with what a suggestive name in the context! And his brilliant description of the Po Valley agriculture, with its almost Egyptian system of irrigation, and with its traditional silk-culture, leaves the reader feeling that no population with such a background of patience, conservatism, skill, and intelligence, could be reasonably expected to spring to arms behind a Mazzini when such a master-craftsman as Cavour invited their professional collaboration. For Cavour learned early (though via rice!) what Mazzini never learned, that to obtain a genuine fabric, even as sheer a fabric as silk, you cannot begin operations by tearing the silkworm from the cocoon. And Italy in the first half of the last century was a cocoon.

The University of Virginia. STRINGFELLOW BARR.

Great Britain and the German Trade Rivalry, 1875–1914. By Ross J. S. Hoffman, Ph. D., New York University. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1933. Pp. xii, 363. $3.50.)

Dr. Hoffman has made a signal contribution to three important and neglected subjects: "first, the inroad made by commercial and industrial Germany upon the far-flung business empire of Great Britain; second, the British national reaction to this German rivalry, and third, the influence of that rivalry upon the shaping of British policy toward Germany" (p. vii).

The account of the reaction of British opinion to the German trade rivalry is the most successful part of the book. The outcry of threatened or doomed industries; the laments of those who thought England was "through"; the arguments, sound and specious, of the fair traders and imperialists; the attempts of politicians like Balfour to utilize anti-German sentiment for electoral purposes—this babel of voices, loud and shrill in times of depression, sinking to an angry muttering as trade revived, the author has skillfully described.

In the past, discussion of Anglo-German trade rivalry has lacked a solid statistical foundation. Dr. Hoffman seeks, by an analysis of trade returns and consular reports, to supply this foundation. Tables and charts set forth the facts of British and German production and export from 1871 to 1913, not merely as a whole, but in detail. Most of the charts show the German curve rising more rapidly than the British; in the production of some articles, such as steel, and in some markets, particularly Continental Europe, the German curve rises triumphantly above the British. These figures and tables are valuable, but it is necessary to state that they must be used with caution. An examination of a score of references chosen at random from the first forty pages showed two incorrect references and four errors in the transcription of figures. None of these errors is of great importance, but unfortunately it is not possible to say that this dreary spade work is done once and for all. The task of other students will, however, be much easier because of Dr. Hoffman's labors.

The conclusions drawn from the facts of commerce and industry are, in the opinion of the present reviewer, far too sweeping. It is evident throughout that Dr. Hoffman is convinced that Britain was economically on the down grade, and this conviction governs his distribution of emphasis and his reasoning. He repeats the often-made but unproved assertion that in the years preceding the war "it was evident enough that the industrial foundations of British prosperity were weakening" (p. 96). Trade statistics do not bear out his contention that in 1885 "England's entrepôt trade was in a state of partial dissolution" (p. 67), and that the opening of the Suez Canal "did to nineteenth-century England what Vasco da Gama's voyage did to sixteenth-century Italy" (p. 71). These are merely examples. The danger of more than tenta-

tive generalization from statistics is repeatedly ignored. In his concluding chapter he is equally dogmatic: "That the anti-German orientation of the British mind and British world policy sprang chiefly from the great economic competition seems incontrovertibly proved" (p. 304).

Despite defects, however, this is a valuable book, based on wide and thorough research, a book which will strongly influence future studies of Anglo-German relations. As a pioneer in a difficult field of study, Dr. Hoffman deserves high praise.

Princeton University. R. J. Sontag.

The Queen and Mr. Gladstone. By Philip Guedalla. (Garden City: Doubleday and Company. 1934. Pp. vi, 793. $5.00.)

One naturally expects much from this book. When Mr. Guedalla writes 150 pages on Gladstone's experiences with Queen Victoria, one is assured that an important relationship will be subjected to keen and sensitive analysis, and that none of its dramatic or humorous values will be lost to sight. When he prints 1200 related documents of which less than a quarter were previously known, he offers, not only fresh material on all the great issues of a momentous period, but an opportunity to test the selection made by Mr. Buckle for the *Letters of Queen Victoria.* The chance of applying a test just here is especially welcome; for there have been suggestions that Mr. Buckle's principle of selection involved the presentation of a picture which failed to do justice to Gladstone. The result is a vindication both of Mr. Buckle and his alleged victim. By giving space to this new material, extremely valuable as it is, Mr. Buckle would have sacrificed the comprehensiveness of his work: without this new material Gladstone's patience under royal provocation could not be fully known. That friction and resentment frequently underlay the appearances of cordiality which sovereign and minister usually managed to maintain, seems to have been much more her fault than his. If he failed to understand or to make due allowances for her, she did not attempt, even when the days of strife had passed, to understand or to make allowances for him. Mr. Guedalla published before he was able to quote the late Lord Esher's *Journals and Letters* on the queen's reaction to her great minister's death: "She was displeased with the Prince of W. acting Pall Bearer. . . . She said, 'I am sorry for Mrs. Gladstone; as for him, I never liked him, and I will say nothing about him.'"

The reasons for her attitude, if mainly personal, were also in some measure institutional. It was largely her personal conviction of infallibility which caused her to reprove her premier for disagreeing with her even in the most tactful and deferential manner possible, and to administer humiliating snubs when he ventured to go on arguing. It was mainly her self-centeredness and tendency to hypochondria which led her to reproach him bitterly when he

implored her to undergo slight inconveniences in order that the popularity of the monarchy should be maintained, and that her ministers might have convenient access to her in times of parliamentary crises. But her occasional efforts to control the selection of ministers, to restrain the utterances even of the premier, and to determine the policies of her cabinets showed that she retained some of that conception of her position as a sovereign which she had learned in early days from Leopold I of Belgium, Prince Albert, and Stockmar. As Theodore Martin recorded long ago, they had taught her that "the twaddle about Ministers being responsible for every fault of head or heart" would "not keep matters straight" and that the sovereign should be "a permanent Premier", taking rank over "the temporary head of the Cabinet", and "supreme" in "matters of discipline". Disraeli helped to keep ideas of this sort alive, *e. g.*, when he stigmatized as unconstitutional, as "only a piece of Parliamentary gossip", the assertion that the speech from the throne was "only the Speech of the Ministers". The queen was one of the last great personages in England to adapt herself to the democratic and reforming spirit of the time: Gladstone was one of the first. He believed and preached publicly that ultimate sovereignty lay only in the people and the lower House; and he asked the royal concurrence in policies, domestic and foreign, which filled the queen with conscientious dread. Through two persons, each wise, informed, courageous, and convinced, two institutions, supposedly long reconciled, were frequently in conflict. As, with the passage of the years, Gladstone proceeded to go even beyond the reforming spirit of his public, and as the queen still lagged behind, the breach between them could not but grow wider.

Mr. Guedalla's introduction makes very good reading. After some amusing aphorisms about the writing of biography, and a description of his *dramatis personæ* (excellent as regards Victoria), he launches into a typically anecdotal narrative. The two great personages pass from "Convergence" and "Harmony" to "Estrangement" and "Antipathy" along a path that is all variety, light and shade. Of the company which surrounds them Disraeli is portrayed as extremely underhanded and ungenerous. This portrait is the child of Mr. Guedalla's principle of selection. Gladstone's special admirers may see in it the working of retributive justice.

Wesleyan University. HERBERT C. BELL.

The Struggle for South Africa, 1875–1899: a Study in Economic Imperialism. By REGINALD IVAN LOVELL, Ph. D. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. xv, 438. $4.00.)

Railway and Customs Policies in South Africa, 1885–1910. By JEAN VAN DER POEL, M. A., B. Ed., Ph. D. [Imperial Studies, No. 8, General

Editor, A. P. Newton.] (London: Longmans, Green and Company. 1933. Pp. 151.)

THESE two books are as complementary as their titles suggest. The first is "a pioneer attempt to relate with its wider context the history of interstate and international relations in South Africa" in the quarter century prior to the second Boer War. The author makes extensive and penetrating use of the voluminous materials to be found in British *Parliamentary Papers* and *Hansard,* supplemented not only from memoirs and special works but also from the several large collections of diplomatic documents published since the World War. His method of presentation, while not conducive to rapid reading, rewards study. He sets forth his evidence with much particularity, constantly weaving a multiplicity of threads into his pattern, but he is generous with conclusions and with inferences which the circumstantial character of a considerable part of the evidence leads him to enlarge upon for the reader's guidance. The motives and methods of economic imperialism invite his caustic comment, though he grants that economic imperialists may sometimes have honest as well as mixed motives, and that in any case South Africa, with its diamonds and gold, was bound to attract their attention. Among European powers, Portugal, with its ancient African interest revived by developments in the interior, and Germany, with its expanding trade and capital drawing it into the colonial field, played direct parts in the diplomacy of South Africa. But European diplomacy concerning South Africa, particularly Anglo-German, was critically interrelated with problems of the European balance of power, as the author brings out in detail with regard to such matters as the Heligoland Treaty and the Kruger Telegram.

The British "imperial factor" was anathema to republican leaders like Kruger, but it was also deprecated by men like Rhodes, who hoped to establish a South African federal state, essentially autonomous even if advantageously associated with the British empire. Gold of the Rand made the Transvaal the economic center and spurred Boer republican ambition to gather the rest of the sub-continent under its ægis. Rhodes, from the Cape and with the support of the Cape Dutch, tried by expansion northward under the South Africa Company to encircle the Transvaal while eliminating the imperial factor in local policy. Failing in the aim of encirclement when the Transvaal's possession of the Rand was supplemented by an independent railway outlet to Delagoa Bay, Rhodes resorted to illegal conspiracy, which, however aptly contrived, was rendered abortive by Jameson's bungling and alienated the Cape Dutch upon whom Rhodes had depended for his political power in Cape Colony. The second Boer War "came because Milner convinced the British Government that it was necessary, owing not to the success of Rhodes's policy, but to its failure".

For the briefer work South African as well as British *Parliamentary*

Papers have been drawn upon and important use has also been made of the papers of J. X. Merriman in the South African Public Library at Capetown. The volume is concise and sharply focused. In clear and circumstantial narrative it sets forth the basic significance of railways and customs in stimulating commercial rivalry among the colonies and states of South Africa, in promoting the formation of competitive groupings and alternative dreams of unification under the leadership of rival sections, and finally in hastening the creation of the Union of South Africa, which was fundamentally the political recognition of the economic unity and interdependence of its sections.

Queen's University. REGINALD G. TROTTER.

British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898–1914. Edited by G. P. GOOCH, D. Litt., F. B. A., and HAROLD TEMPERLEY, Litt. D., F. B. A. Volume IX, *The Balkan Wars.* Part I, *The Prelude; The Tripoli War.* (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1933. Pp. lxxvi, 873. 17*s.* 6*d.*)

IN most of the Balkan questions from 1909 to October 8, 1912, which form the unified subject of this volume Great Britain was not primarily interested. She inclined to stand aside as an observer, and Sir Edward Grey's frequent minute, "Wait", was not inappropriate. His main general aim was to prevent the Balkan pot from boiling over dangerously and involving the great powers. Hence when Russia frequently, and France occasionally, urged Triple Entente joint action, Grey insisted that all the great powers should act in concert and not in two opposing groups (pp. 364, 398 ff., 540). To be sure, he was very careful to maintain an intimate and confidential coöperation with France and Russia, in order to prevent Germany from prying the three Entente friends apart and getting the hegemony of Europe, which was feared by his chief advisers, Nicolson and Hardinge (pp. 120–125). But, ever with an eye on Parliament and public opinion, he warned all his ambassadors against using the expression "Triple Entente", "which is no doubt convenient, but if it appeared in a Parliamentary Bluebook it would be assumed to have some special official meaning and might provoke inconvenient comment or inquiry" (p. 6).

There were three questions, however, connected with the Balkans in which Grey was keenly interested. In accordance with an important Admiralty Memorandum (pp. 413–416), he was opposed to having Italy increase her sea power in the Eastern Mediterranean by retaining the Ægean Islands captured in the Tripolitan War. To Russia's further aims for opening the Straits to Russian warships alone he remained as opposed as Lord Salisbury had been in 1897 (pp. 774–776) and as he himself had been in

1908 after the Buchlau affair (pp. 50–54, 201–204, 340–350, 396–397). And he was seriously annoyed at the heavy British shipping losses caused by the closing of the Dardanelles against an Italian attack. "Treaty or no Treaty I think our interest in the grain trade and commercial shipping connected with the Black Sea is such that we could not stand the Black Sea trade being stopped by this wretched [Tripolitan] war" (p. 332; *cf.* also 385–394).

British representatives abroad were usually exceptionally well informed. Grey was kept pretty accurately posted on the jealousies which kept the Balkan States divided against themselves until Russia aided in the formation of the very secret Balkan League in March, 1912. Sir H. Bax-Ironside sent a substantially accurate report of this from Sofia immediately (pp. 556–565), though it was not until June that its significance began to be realized, when Mr. Barclay reported from Belgrade the reckless and belligerent talk of Izvolski's Serbian counterpart, M. Spalaikovitch: Russia had induced Serbia and Bulgaria to form an alliance, to be joined by Greece and Montenegro, in order to enable Russia to impose her will in the Balkans, to bar Austria's advance, and to drive the Turks out of Europe. "Victory", added Spalaikovitch, "would mean the crushing of Germany, the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine to France, the saving of millions a year in shipbuilding to Great Britain, in fact, the beginning of an era of peace to Europe! . . . Russia was daily increasing her armaments; not from fear of aggression, for she knew she would not be attacked, but with a view to pursuing an active policy" (p. 573). Meanwhile M. Pashitich was brazenly proclaiming that no alliance existed (pp. 576, 593). By the end of August Mr. Barclay observed accurately: "Russia by encouraging the system of alliances under her ægis has been playing with fire and may not be able to stamp it out" (p. 657); and Sir Arthur Nicolson commented correctly: "M. Sazonov should have thought of all this sooner. Now he appears to have lost his head" (p. 654); "M. Sazonov is now alarmed at the situation which he himself has done so much to create" (p. 670).

Noteworthy also is the accurate account of the Serbian "Black Hand" (p. 538), and the interesting secret report of the cynical views of the Young Turk leaders who had not the slightest intention of giving equality to non-Moslems and who were ready to disperse the Turkish parliament by force (pp. 207–209). Marxian anti-Wall Street historians will note with satisfaction Sir Rennell Rodd's surmise that the Tripoli War was caused in part by the intrigues of Italian banks which were deeply involved in Tripolitan investments: "That a strong propaganda has been made by the Banca Romana in the Italian press there is, I think, little doubt, and it is unfortunately true that a considerable proportion of the innumerable journals published in this country could not exist without financial assistance, so that

such a campaign is easily organized and is not prohibitively costly as an investment" (p. 293).

In some matters, however, the British were not accurately informed. They did not believe that Roumania was bound to Austria by an alliance (p. 73). Nor did they believe that Russia and Italy had made a secret bargain at Racconigi (pp. 79–84)—"a mare's nest, and a lot of money has been wasted on telegraphing" (p. 129).

In view of the present-day interest in the sins of the munition makers it may be noted that in these 800 pages their sinister shadow flits across the scene only five times: Willy's urging on Nicky the placing in Germany of orders for Russian battleships (p. 585); an inquiry as to whether there was objection to Cammell Lairds' selling to Greece two battleships being constructed for Argentina (p. 762); an alleged Russian effort to dissuade Turkey from signing a contract with Armstrong for cruisers (p. 560); a London *Times* report of a trainload of German war material sent to Turkey (p. 523); and Grey's statement that the British were doing all they could to prevent the smuggling of French arms and ammunition into Afghanistan via Muscat (p. 765).

The volume closes with the usual admirable index of names and subjects and several interesting appendixes: Gladstone's correspondence with Count Károlyi in 1880 concerning the Austrian occupation of Bosnia; Mr. Wickham Steed's reasons for suspecting Aehrenthal of collusion with Ferdinand of Bulgaria at the beginning of the Bosnian Crisis; a spicy letter from Herr Sigmund Münz in regard to the famous Cartwright Interview; and a letter by Sir Edward Grey in 1932 in which he regrets the publishing of "minutes" by his subordinates.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

Die englische Politik im Juli 1914: Eine Gesamtdarstellung der Julikrise. Von ERNST ANRICH, Privatdozent der neueren Geschichte an der Universität Bonn. [Beiträge zur Geschichte der nachbismarckischen Zeit und des Weltkriegs.] (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer. 1934. Pp. xiii, 536. 24 M.)

THIS interesting book is at once conventional and original. Herr Anrich makes the common German assumptions, (1) that the Austrian policy toward Serbia in July, 1914, was fully justified, and (2) that Great Britain had it in her power to prevent a general war. On the other hand he does not doubt the sincere desire of Sir Edward Grey to see peace preserved and approves many of his steps to that end. The first error of the British foreign secretary, in the author's opinion, was his failure to take decisive action in the weeks preceding the Austrian ultimatum. As early as July 6 he heard from Lichnowsky, the German ambassador, that Germany would support

Austria in strong measures; two days later Grey admitted to Cambon, the French ambassador, that a highly dangerous situation might result if the Austrian policy provoked Russian intervention; on July 16 the British government was given a strong hint in both Vienna and London as to the nature of the Austrian demands. Yet Grey did nothing until July 20, when he suggested to Russia the desirability of a direct conversation with Austria; but he did not press the proposal when it was declined by Russia and France, and did not inform the other powers of it. Herr Anrich's explanation of this failure to act is: (1) The British press, which, to a considerable extent sympathized with Austria, gave no lead (the Irish question was approaching a crisis); (2) reports from Vienna did not make clear the vital issues involved for Austria in the Southern Slav problem; and (3) above all, Grey was reluctant to speak decisively in St. Petersburg from fear of endangering the Anglo-Russian entente. In a previous book, *Die jugoslawische Frage und die Julikrise 1914* (1931), which was intended as an introduction to the present volume, Herr Anrich argued that although Great Britain had no direct interest in Serbia, her failure to offer armed support to Russia in the Bosnian crisis and her counsels of moderation in 1912–1913 had brought British diplomacy to the point where, in the event of a new crisis, it would have to stand by Russia or sacrifice the entente; all the more so in view of the grave tension between the two powers in Persia. Hence Grey did not dare try to restrain Russia from armed intervention in behalf of Serbia. Herr Anrich concedes that Grey did warn the German and Austrian ambassadors against reckless action but complains that he did not indicate the limits to which Austria might go without provoking Russia.

When the crisis broke, Grey tried to preserve his freedom of action by resisting at once the pressure of his subordinates and the appeals of Russia and France for a declaration of solidarity. It was only when he proposed a conference to mediate between Austria and Serbia that, in the author's opinion, Grey began to take definitely the side of Russia. Instead he should, so Herr Anrich contends, have put pressure on Sazonov, who was still wavering on July 26 and July 27, to prevent hasty military measures on the part of Russia. The argument is ably put, but the author does not sufficiently appreciate that after the Serbian reply Grey thought Austria in the wrong and not unnaturally placed little trust in the assurances of Austrian territorial disinterestedness, which, for that matter, were never very clearly conveyed to London.

For the entire crisis Herr Anrich lays much emphasis on the attitude of the press, which was anything but united and thus seriously handicapped Grey's action. It is worth noting that until Germany declared war on Russia the *Daily Telegraph* exhibited strong Austrian sympathies and the *Standard* was sharply anti-Russian—both Conservative papers.

The Belgian question was from first to last a political issue, in both the press and the cabinet. Grey used it as a lever to take England into the war when his colleagues rejected intervention on the side of France; later it was of incalculable value in saddling Germany with responsibility for the war. But, so Herr Anrich insists, the legal or moral issue was not raised until the question of intervention had been settled. He points out incidentally that Germany, by her ultimatum to Belgium, played into Grey's hands, whereas an attack without warning, as desired by the German general staff, would have delayed the British decision—and have held up the mobilization of the British army and its transport to the Continent.

One does not have to agree with Herr Anrich on all his contentions to recognize that he has written a dispassionate and honest book which may be recommended to those who think that there is nothing new to be said about July, 1914. Also he has a very poor opinion of German diplomacy, which, if it wished to keep the peace, committed quite as many blunders as the British foreign office.

The University of Chicago. BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

The League of Nations in Theory and Practice. By C. K. WEBSTER, M. A., Litt. D., Fellow of the British Academy. With some chapters on international co-operation by SYDNEY HERBERT, M. A. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1933. Pp. 330. $2.75.)

IT is the value of the historical method in the study of institutions that that method reveals the processes of evolution involved. In his work on *The League of Nations in Theory and Practice* Professor Webster has brought to bear his wide knowledge of the diplomacy of the nineteenth century. In his opening chapters he has probably provided as useful a summary as exists of the development of peace methods and peace machinery prior to the drafting of the Covenant. He has made it clear that the germs of the League idea had already been present in the Concert of Europe, in the Hague conferences, in the development of arbitration, and in Mr. Bryan's cooling-off treaties. The statesmen of 1919, and above all, President Wilson, with these conceptions to start from, developed an international organization which consolidated these ideas, harmonized the principle of the equality of states with the leadership of the great powers, provided through the frequency of its meetings a greater degree of permanence, and a more frequent expression of the international viewpoint, and centralized in considerable measure the various international activities of the nations of the world.

This institution (and here again Professor Webster's historical method makes the point clear) has itself evolved in the fifteen years of its existence. It was wisely drafted not as a rigid legal document, but as a flexible instrument

of world coöperation; and with time its emphases have been modified. The coercive machinery of the Covenant has been much whittled away; Article 10, the famous territorial guaranty, and Article 16, providing for an economic boycott, have been much attenuated by interpretation; confidence in "sanctions" has given way to the use of the machinery of conciliation and publicity. Despite the usual objectivity of his manner, Professor Webster makes it clear that he sympathizes with this evolution, and in this no doubt he reflects the preponderant British opinion. It is curious, though, that he does not even mention the "sanction" which the League adopted in the Manchurian question at the instigation of the United States, that is, the non-recognition policy which is now known as the Stimson doctrine.

The striking characteristic of this book is its combination of sympathies and candor. It exaggerates nothing; it does not extenuate the League failures; it is remarkably dispassionate throughout; and recognizes that the only final test of the League's value is the test of time.

The work, though bearing the imprint 1933, was completed in December, 1932. It does not deal, therefore, with the German withdrawal from the League, or with the breakdown of the World Disarmament Conference.

The chapters on international coöperation by Sydney Herbert, while a little summary, are of the same high quality as the rest of the book, and are characterized by the same general attitude. Of the whole, it may be said that no work on the League is so well attuned to the historical mind, and none sums up the problems in better fashion.

The University of Rochester. DEXTER PERKINS.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by DUMAS MALONE. Volumes XI–XIV, *Larned-Platner.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1933–1934. Pp. x, 620; x, 647; x, 649; x, 648. $12.50 each; $250 for the complete set.)

THE four new volumes of the *Dictionary* offer an impressive addition to the biographical record of the building of American civilization. As the set nears completion, its indispensable utility for historical students of American thought and achievement becomes constantly more manifest. Not only are familiar figures treated in crisp and usually interesting sketches, but countless less known characters are, for the first time, given their just due. Moreover, the wide net spread by the editors has caught not only those whom the pious and the patriotic delight to honor, but also those who climbed the ladder of worldly success wrong by wrong. It is a motley assemblage that the *Dictionary* portrays; the present volumes find space for one who was "variously considered a fool, a knave, and a seer" (XIV, 10), and with evident gusto

recite the career of the colorful person who introduced the game of craps into America (XII, 283).

Scholars who are interested in individual lives merely as data for deducing broader traits and trends of the national character will also find the *Dictionary* rich in suggestion and information. Numberless instances down to our own generation vouch for the substance that underlay the Horatio Alger conception of the opportunities of American life. The boy born in an almshouse gains repute as a dramatic critic (XII, 212), or the youthful baggagemaster rises to the position of railway president (XII, 285). Even more impressive are the life stories of the two deaf-mutes who earned admission to the columns of Volume XIII because of their achievements respectively as poet and lithographer. Illustrations also abound of that irrepressible energy of the American character which makes a man seek distinction in several fields rather than concentrate his efforts in a single one. Thus one person is labeled "ornithologist and wholesale druggist" (XI, 49); another, "wood engraver, political reformer, poet, and printer" (XI, 284); and yet another, "physician, merchant, political leader, magazine editor, poet, and critic" (XII, 63). It is to be regretted that certain data of interest to students who possess what might be called a sociological bent are sometimes lacking. This is notably true in the case of scholars who may wish to study the influence of parental occupations upon the children's choice of life careers. Volume XIV fails to give this essential information in 260 of its memoirs; Volume XII in 274, including those of James Madison, O. C. Marsh, and William L. Marcy. Sixty-seven sketches in the last-named volume even omit the fathers' names, a neglect for which explanations are offered in but six instances.

The four volumes under review add respectively 665, 695, 706, and 674 biographies to those already printed, bringing the grand total to 9536. The names honored by greatest frequency of mention are Moore, 42 times; Mitchel, Mitchell, and Mitchill, 36; Lee and Parker, 32 each; Lewis and Morris, 29 each; and Miller, 28. The number of contributors varies from 354 in the eleventh volume to 415 in the thirteenth, the latter representing the most extensive collaboration of any volume yet published. With more than 2700 memoirs from which to choose, any selection of articles of outstanding merit is certain to be inadequate. In such a list, however, one would want to include D. S. Freeman's "Robert Edward Lee", G. P. Merrill's "Joseph Leidy", Louise P. Kellogg's "Meriwether Lewis", J. G. Randall's "Abraham Lincoln", R. C. Hayes's "Robert R. Livingston" (1746–1813), V. W. Crane's "Edward McCrady", J. G. de R. Hamilton's "George McDuffie", J. H. Peeling's "Thomas McKean", J. W. Pratt's "James Madison" (1750–1836), E. S. Corwin's "John Marshall", K. B. Murdock's "Increase Mather", Van Wyck Brooks's "Herman Melville", H. B. Lemon's "Albert Abraham Michelson", A. W. Atwood's "John Pierpont Morgan", D. S. Muzzey's "Gouverneur

Morris", Max Lerner's "Charles Wyman Morse", F. L. Paxson's "Oliver Perry Morton", E. P. Cheyney's "John Lothrop Motley", S. E. Morison's "James Otis", A. H. Meneely's "Walter Hines Page", Crane Brinton's "Thomas Paine", F. A. Christie's "Theodore Parker", Broadus Mitchell's "Simon Nelson Patten", Paul Weiss's "Charles Saunders Peirce", W. A. Robinson's "Timothy Pickering", R. F. Nichols's "Franklin Pierce", and J. J. Dolan's "William Pinkney".

Grateful as the reviewer is for the riches provided by the editors, he wishes that space might have been found for biographies of Jacob H. Lazarus (1825–1891), painter; Stephen W. Leach (1821–1895), musical composer; James R. Leaming (1820–1892), medical scientist; Lewis B. Lent (1814–1887), showman; John H. Lester (1815–1900), inventor; Lillian Lewis (Marston) (1852–1899), actress and playwright; George Linen (1802–1888), painter; John Z. Little (1838–1900), actor and writer of melodramas; James B. Lord (1859–1902), architect; David D. Lloyd (1851–1889), journalist; James N. McElligott (1812–1866), educator and author of school textbooks; Archibald McKellar (1844–1901), sculptor; Philip W. Mackenzie (1824–1891), inventor; Isabel A. Mallon ("Ruth Ashmore") (1857–1898), author; Laura S. Mapleson (1862–1894), grand-opera singer; Samuel Marsh (1796–1874), who probably originated the "American system of colportage"; Harrison Millard (1829–1895), musical composer; Mary N. Moran (1842–1899), painter; Henry W. Morse (1858–1897), light-opera composer; and Frank J. Patton (1852–1900), inventor. The necessary brevity with which many memoirs in the *Dictionary* are written, together with the lack of adequate biographical treatments elsewhere, provides opportunities for scholars who may wish to prepare longer studies of certain figures, notably B. H. Latrobe (1764–1820), William Leggett, Pierre Charles L'Enfant, Frank Leslie, Meriwether Lewis, William L. Marcy, Luther Martin, Henry Meiggs, Thomas Mifflin, Simon Newcomb, Charles Willson Peale, James Duval Phelan, and William Pinkney.

As in some of the earlier volumes, certain sketches fall short of the mark because of distortion of emphasis. Thus, so much attention is devoted to J. G. A. Leishman's boyhood in an orphanage that apparently no space remained for an account or appraisal of his career as minister to Switzerland, Italy, and Germany. In a somewhat similar fashion G. P. Marsh's twenty-one years' service as minister to Italy is dismissed with a single sentence, while Joseph McKenna's twenty-seven years on the United States Supreme Court receive but six sentences of vague characterization, though the author avers that McKenna spoke for the Court "in some exceedingly important cases" (XII, 88). Almost as unsatisfactory is the memoir of Mr. Justice Peckham which, though cataloguing his leading opinions, leaves the reader in the dark as to his guiding legal principles. In general, the careers of un-

scrupulous capitalists are treated with a commendable lack of reticence (see particularly the sketches of J. H. Mitchell, W. H. Moore, and C. W. Morse); yet J. A. Patten, who pleaded guilty to a Federal charge of conspiracy in cornering the cotton market, is characterized as having "a keen sense of the responsibility that goes with wealth" (XIV, 298). Contributors sometimes make assertions difficult to reconcile. Thus, one calls the Amana Society "the most successful experiment in communism in America" (XII, 586), while another denominates the Oneida Community as "the most successful of all American Utopias" (XIII, 590). Thus, too, the reader learns that Alice Freeman Palmer changed Wellesley "from a glorified boarding-school to a genuine college" (XIV, 174), though from an earlier volume it appears that instruction at Wellesley had attained "a level with that available for men" (IX, 274) before she took charge. On successive pages the publication date of Samuel Longfellow's biography of his poet-brother is given variously as 1891 and 1886–1887 (XI, 386, 387).

Other careless or erroneous statements appear. No American party organization ever bore the name, "the Anti-Slavery party" (XI, 84). Far from being the first boycotting agreement against the British government (XI, 118), the action of Westmoreland County in February, 1766, had been anticipated by New York, Albany, Philadelphia, Boston, and other places. Webster was not Secretary of State under Van Buren (XI, 141–142), nor was the National Republican party in existence as late as 1840 (XI, 546). The jobless marchers of the state of Washington should not be called "Coxey's Army" (XII, 56). A definition of John Hay's open-door policy as "a self-denial of special privilege" (XII, 108) is inadequate and misleading. President Cleveland brought about the repeal of the Sherman silver-purchase law, not the Bland-Allison Act (XII, 144). C. C. Pinckney, not James Monroe (XII, 190), was Madison's chief rival for the presidency in 1808. The congressional elections took place in 1850 and 1858, not in 1851 and 1859 (XII, 311). Contributors continue to fall into the error of saying that members of the Senate voted on the impeachment of President Johnson (XIII, 169, 200; see also earlier, IX, 298). It gives a wrong impression to say that Myrick's Farmers' Political League was "the germ of the so-called Farm Bloc" of later years (XIII, 377). The assertion that Mark Twain was a forerunner of "Orpheus C. Kerr" (XIII, 459) violates chronology, nor was "gross misspelling" a distinguishing characteristic of the latter humorist. Andrew Jackson entered the White House in 1829, not 1828 (XIII, 521). Few would agree that Parton's lives of Franklin and Jefferson "are still the best for the general reader" (XIV, 280). If the statement that "the first *Republican Campaign Text Book*" dates from 1880 (XIV, 544) applies to anything but the publication of the first campaign manual under that exact title, it is untrue.

Certain inconsistencies of editorial usage continue to appear. Thus, in

the following instances, both forms may be found: "Rev." and "the Rev." (sometimes in the same memoir); "Porto Rico" and "Puerto Rico"; "Tokio" and "Tokyo"; "whiskey" and "whisky"; "Scotch" and "Scots". On the other hand, the editors, improving upon their earlier practice, now consistently omit the apostrophe in "Harpers Ferry". On the spelling of foreign place-names the editorial board would do well to follow the recommendations of the United States Geographic Board (*First Report on Foreign Geographic Names,* Washington, 1932). The reviewer questions the use of the double negative in constructions like "Manning was not a speechmaker nor an office seeker" (XII, 249), of which repeated instances may be found. If this practice is defensible grammatically, it does not represent the best English style (see H. W. Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage,* London, 1926, p. 381). Nevertheless, when due allowance is made for such detailed criticisms as this review contains, the *Dictionary* still stands forth as a superb achievement. In technical editorial competence, as well as in other respects, it sets a standard which seldom, if ever, has been equaled in America.

Harvard University. ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER.

The Colonial Period of American History. By CHARLES M. ANDREWS, Farnam Professor of American History, Emeritus, Yale University. Volume I., *The Settlements.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1934. Pp. xiv, 551. $4.00.)

IN our time possibly no event in American historiography has been so keenly anticipated as the publication of the *magnum opus* of the dean of American colonial historians, Professor Charles McLean Andrews. From him we have expected a definitive work in which would be joined the fruits of a lifetime of original investigation with the mature conclusions of a great teacher of English and American history. It is clear that we are not to be disappointed. In this first volume he carries the record of English enterprise in settlement and governmental organization to about the middle of the seventeenth century; he views a scene as broad as the field of English expansion westward in that epoch, from Newfoundland to Guiana; and he maintains throughout the perspective of the mother country. That his approach lacks the novelty of a historical revision is because he has so often asserted its validity in the past, both in detailed studies and in illuminating essays. It is still true, however, that this is the first comprehensive history of the English colonies in America to be written within this formula.

Comprehensive this history promises to be, but not quite all-embracing. After an introductory view of the age of discovery, the economic and social forces underlying English expansion are admirably expounded in two chapters on "England's Commercial Activities" and "Factors influencing Coloniza-

tion"; to these influences the author constantly recurs in later chapters. There is less emphasis throughout, however, upon the social and material forces operating in America itself to distinguish one area from another and to differentiate colonist from Englishman. (The latter theme Professor Andrews regards as appropriate rather to the eighteenth than to the seventeenth century.) Indeed, in this volume economic developments in the colonies find only incidental mention. Thus tobacco culture in Virginia is considered chiefly in connection with the tobacco contract and English policy; the fur trade as one means by which the Undertakers of New Plymouth secured money to buy out the English capitalists. To be sure, the influence of the fishery upon the pattern of life in certain parts of New England, as well as upon English projects, is more fully developed. In the concluding chapter there is a brief account of the rise of commerce in the Bay colony.

For his main task the author has taken the history of the development of the plantations at the significant level of their public institutions and their links with England. None could be more congenial to his talents. For him institutional history is no mere political science of the past, but a broadly human study. Always he manages to convey a sense of the vigorous life of migrating English folk as they filled, and in their turn transformed, the molds of civil and religious society contrived for them in England.

One of his most noteworthy contributions is in demonstrating more thoroughly then ever before the interlocking character of various colonizing schemes of the early seventeenth century, through a painstaking inspection of the personnel of their promoters, and of interacting trading, fishing, and planting enterprises in such English centers as London, Plymouth, Bristol, Dorchester, East Anglia. The entire movement is seen as closely integrated in origins, and especially in methods, despite the variety of motives at work. Again, with his broad view of the whole sphere of English western expansion, Professor Andrews is able to bring illumination from one area of settlement to bear upon difficult problems elsewhere: notably in his analogies from Bermuda to Virginia and again to Massachusetts Bay.

The chapters on Virginia, though written before the appearance of W. F. Craven's study, are at most points in agreement with the latter's conclusions respecting the later history of the company. Especially important is the discussion of the process by which the dubious issue of self-government in Virginia was kept alive for fifteen years after 1624. Professor Andrews draws the striking deduction that "the Virginians themselves were largely responsible for the establishment of self-government in a royal colony in America" (p. 204). Elsewhere he brings to focus the experiences of both Bermuda and Virginia to overthrow a common opinion, "prejudiced by the long-dominant Whig tradition", that Stuart policy was hostile to popular government in the colonies (pp. 243–244).

In his chapters on the colonization of Massachusetts Bay Professor Andrews reveals not merely exhaustive scholarship but a juster sense of balance in a vexed controversial field than is common even to-day. He appreciates the grandiose feudal plans of Gorges; he sympathizes with Maverick and his kind; he relishes the "whimsical career" of Thomas Morton, "amid the encircling gloom of the Pilgrim and Puritan surroundings" (p. 332); he is fair to Roger Williams and the other rebels; but he neither misunderstands nor misrepresents the aims and methods of Puritan rule. In a penetrating analysis of the workings of the Puritan commonwealth he discards as superficial the old label of theocracy. The genesis of the "New England Way" in the churches he views in much the same light as does Perry Miller, without quite rejecting a possible influence from New Plymouth (pp. 299, 379); but here he demonstrates also an interesting parallel from Bermuda (p. 380). In tracing the preliminary stages of the founding of Massachusetts he makes generous acknowledgment to Mrs. Rose-Troup, but he has much to add of his own. A masterly survey of the grants of 1622 and 1628 leads on to a definitive history of the royal charter, in which he lays a number of lively ghosts. The motives for the transfer of charter and government are at last stated with admirable precision. Indeed this whole discussion is a model of brilliant reasoning restrained by due respect for difficulties arising from the destruction of documents. Only at one point is there a possible straining of the proofs. The evidence that Robert Gorges had taken actual possession of his own grant on Massachusetts Bay "by a settled plantation" rests, as Professor Andrews states, upon the interested allegation of Sir Ferdinando Gorges. In one place Professor Andrews writes that there is some reason to think that the settlement was made (p. 339); later he asserts the fact without sufficient qualification as a flaw in the title of the New England Company: the patent, he writes, was drafted by some person who was "apparently ignorant of the fact that Gorges' servants were there, holding by right of occupation" (p. 365).

It has been possible to name only a few of the original features of this penetrating volume. A false impression would be left of its scope, however, if examples were cited only from the chapters on Virginia, Bermuda, Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay. There is an excellent account of the failure at Sagadahoc, a failure which, as he points out, did not leave that region quite "an empty world". Both here and in his account of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, the author gives full value to the fishery as an element in English colonization. The schemes of John Guy, Calvert, Vaughan, Falkland, and Alexander are admirably presented. With most of these men, as with Gorges, Professor Andrews is on the congenial ground of that aristocratic impulse which in the seventeenth century sought to reproduce in the New World feudal forms of society and local government. Indeed, his

evaluation of the proprietary mode is one of his most notable contributions. Although the theme of international rivalry is less fully developed, its place in the history of Virginia and New England is by no means neglected.

In this earlier period Professor Andrews has relied somewhat less upon his own original studies than he will probably do in later volumes, in which will loom larger the problems of policy and administration. Surprisingly often, however, he writes freshly from the sources. And he has assimilated critically an extensive historical literature; on more than one issue in dispute among scholars he pronounces a weighty verdict. At the lower level of technical scholarship the impression is of an almost uncanny accuracy. At the higher levels of sound construction, vigorous style, judicious interpretation, this great work is begun in the finest traditions of modern historical writing.

The University of Michigan. VERNER W. CRANE.

Hugh Swinton Legaré, a Charleston Intellectual. By LINDA RHEA, Ph. D., Department of English, Ward-Belmont College. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1934. Pp. viii, 279. $3.00.)

HUGH Swinton Legaré was, if one accepts Parrington's estimate, "the most cultivated mind in the South before the Civil War, and one of the most cultivated in America, he was an embodiment of the serious Charleston that served as a counterweight to the gayer". Left deformed by an illness during infancy which induced or confirmed a tendency toward introspection and melancholia, he imposed upon himself a rigorous course of study at South Carolina College, in the law office of Mitchell King, at the University of Edinburgh, and throughout all the remaining days of his short life, and he found in intellectual achievement compensations for what he had lost through his deformity. After his return to Charleston in 1820 Legaré practiced law with indifferent success. He took up eight years later, along with the two Stephen Elliotts, the editorship of the *Southern Review* to which he contributed profound essays on "Classical Learning", "Jeremy Bentham and the Utilitarians", "Lord Byron's Character and Writings", and other subjects. When the *Review* failed in 1832 from want of financial support he permitted himself, largely because Charleston disapproved a career of pure letters, to be drawn back to the law and politics. He served in the general assembly, as attorney-general of the state, as chargé d'affaires in Belgium, in the Twenty-fifth Congress, as Attorney-general in President Tyler's Cabinet, and as Secretary of State *ad interim* after the resignation of Daniel Webster. He died in his forty-seventh year in Boston at the home of his friend George Ticknor.

By gathering up the scattered fragments of the life of this man whose name is well known but whose career is little understood Dr. Rhea has performed a service to historical scholarship. Information has been drawn mainly from

Writings of Hugh Swinton Legaré (Charleston, 1846), manuscripts in the possession of W. G. Chisolm, a great-nephew, and of the Library of Congress, and Charleston and other newspapers, and these have been fully exploited. The literary phase of Legaré's career, decidedly the most important, is well drawn though less so than Parrington's vigorous portrait (*Romantic Revolution,* pp. 114–124). The treatment of Legaré as a public man is less satisfactory, revealing little understanding of politics on the part of the author. Among other questions the real reasons for Legaré's victory over Henry L. Pinckney in the congressional election of 1836 are left undisclosed.

In smaller matters Dr. Rhea has not exercised the vigilance which in general characterizes her work. Inaccuracies in citations to authorities are frequent (*e.g.,* John instead of Charles Fraser, p. 260; Leidig for Leiding, p. 261 *et passim;* Calhoun, *Reminiscences* for *Correspondence,* p. 246). The use of the Charleston Library Society's shelf-marks (p. 234 *et passim*) in citing pamphlets will cause confusion. One will find it difficult to locate John's Island, where Legaré's childhood was spent, "Up the Ashley River" unless he believes, as Charlestonians are said to do, that the Ashley and Cooper rivers unite at Charleston to form the Atlantic Ocean.

College of Charleston. J. H. Easterby.

Aus der Frühzeit des Nordatlantikverkehrs: Studien zur Geschichte der deutschen Schiffahrt und deutschen Auswanderung nach den Vereinigten Staaten bis zum Ende des amerikanischen Bürgerkriegs. Von Hermann Wätjen. (Leipzig: Felix Meiner. 1932. Pp. xx, 219. 6.50 M.)

The economic and social ramifications of the development of trans-Atlantic shipping facilities are of real importance to the student of the problems involved in the transfer of populations and cultures from the old world to the new. In the present volume, the author has emphasized the rise of trans-Atlantic shipping from the late eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth centuries, unfolding the story from the point of view of the achievements and competitive rivalry of the old Hanseatic towns of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck. The account is based on the archival materials of these three cities, and on a mass of reports sent home by their consular representatives in American ports. Both sources are storehouses of miscellaneous information that have hardly been opened, and that may be expected to yield further treasures to the researcher interested in this phase of American-European, and more specifically, German-American relations.

Part I describes the rise of trans-Atlantic commerce, and the competitive activities of German, United States, and other companies for the profits of the trade with Northern Europe. Bremen, in the first stages of this development,

surpassed her rival Hamburg, and became the chief entrepôt for American tobacco, and later cotton, to Europe. For that reason, Bremen's earliest connections were largely with Baltimore. Hamburg concentrated on the sugar and coffee trade with Central and South America, and was slow to appreciate the importance of emigration; therefore she had little direct intercourse with United States ports until well along in the nineteenth century. The rivalry between sailing and steam vessels; the competition between Bremen and Hamburg, and between German, English, and American companies like those of Cornelius Vanderbilt and the builders of the famous "clipper ships"; the rise of the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg-American line; the struggle for subsidies and mail contracts; conditions of sea travel and the numerous mishaps that balked the plans of the shipping magnates, are among the topics considered in the first half of the book.

The real key to the eventual prosperity of these companies is to be found, however, in the emigrant trade. Here was a kind of freight upon which every shipping master could reckon with certainty throughout the nineteenth century, and therefore he could afford to take return cargoes from the United States at cheap rates. Most of the trans-Atlantic sailing vessels of the Hanse towns in this period were emigrant ships, and the same conditions carried over into the age of steam. Part II of this study is therefore quite properly devoted to the problems of emigration, the competition among the European ports for human cargo, the emigrant's experiences and his exploitation by "runners", "sharks", porters, draymen, keepers of "first-class hotels", and others who preyed upon the emigrant at home and in the promised land. Dr. Wätjen has described this nefarious business and the gruesome details of the immigrant plague ships and "swimming coffins" with much detail, a proper sense of balance, and real dramatic force, concluding with a description of those measures gradually adopted both in the United States and abroad to bring an end to the worst features of the emigrant trade. It is this second part of the book that will prove of special interest and usefulness to students of the American immigration problem. The book has the further merit of being written in an interesting style. Its value is increased by numerous statistical tables and eight excellent photographs.

The Ohio State University. CARL WITTKE.

The Illinois Central Railroad and its Colonization Work. By PAUL WALLACE GATES, Assistant Professor of History, Bucknell University. [Harvard Economic Studies, Volume XLII.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1934. Pp. xiii, 374. $4.00.)

PROFESSOR Gates has approached a hard task with great industry and great skill and has achieved an altogether admirable result. He has patiently searched the surviving archives of the Illinois Central Railroad; he has worked

intelligently with the records of the Federal land offices in the office of the auditor of public accounts at Springfield, and with the Brayman, the Ackerman, and the Gillespie Papers in the Chicago Historical Society; he has used numerous private collections of manuscripts, some of them at first blush seemingly as far remote from his subject as the Hasselquist Papers; he has been thorough in his searches of newspaper and pamphlet material and he has put his conclusions together in admirable shape.

As he organizes his material one interesting picture after another develops: the Illinois of 1850 just on the verge of the most far-reaching change in its history; the bonanza cattle ranches and farms of men like Harris, Funk, and Sullivant; the maneuvers of financiers, speculators, promoters, and politicians that brought about the Federal land grant for the railroad; the contest in the Illinois state legislature for possession of its charter between different financial and political groups; the enlistment of English capital in support of the enterprise—until the twentieth century ownership of the Illinois Central was predominantly English. He reveals the resulting anxieties of English capitalists, who promoted the settlement of Illinois to make their investment pay; he appraises the unmeasured enthusiasm of Mr. Cobden and Sir James Caird for the agricultural future of Illinois; he depicts the wrath of British imperialists at Caird's unfavorable contrast of Canada with Illinois; he deals with the drawing in of Scandinavian immigrants and the development of Paxton, the founding of new towns, the promotion by the railroad first of the corn, wheat, hog belt in northern Illinois, then of the fruit areas of southern Illinois along its line; its tribulations in the marketing of its lands and in the sale of town lots. All these pictures Mr. Gates draws with skill, and documents with far-reaching research.

Mr. Gates's closing sentences are something of an overstatement but a natural one for a person who has worked so hard and so enthusiastically as he has:

> The immigrants brought to Illinois by the railroad greatly changed the racial composition of the population. No longer were the southern uplanders of Scotch-Irish descent the dominant element; their places had been taken by the Teuton, the Celt, the Scandinavian, and the Yankee. These newcomers made the Republican party the dominant one in Illinois, and enabled the State to take a prominent part in national politics. Such names as Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, Lyman Trumbull, David Davis, William Jennings Bryan, John Logan, Joseph G. Cannon, and many others bear witness to the important role which Illinois has played in the affairs of the nation.

Mr. Gates demonstrates past doubt the work of the Illinois Central Railroad in promoting the settlement of eastern Illinois, in advertising the state in the East and in Europe, and in assisting the political and economic changes

that followed the new migrations. No doubt its efforts to settle and develop its own lands in eastern Illinois bore fruit to its landowning neighbors. But in promoting the development and the change in the politics of the state as a whole it was but one factor among many. Mr. Gates's list of statesmen who indirectly owe their prominence to the railroad is, when one considers their biographies, in several instances unfortunate. However, most of the people who read Mr. Gates's book will be able to correct his conclusion for themselves; none of them can supply on their own account a tenth of the information he has laid before them in the body of his work.

The University of Illinois. THEODORE CALVIN PEASE.

The Irrepressible Conflict, 1850–1865. By ARTHUR CHARLES COLE, Professor of History, Western Reserve University. [History of American Life, Volume VII.] (New York: Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. xv, 468. $4.00.)

THIS book belongs to the American Life series and takes its general character from that fact. Political events, although given more space than in some of the other volumes, are kept to a minimum and those facts which are supposed to illuminate "the daily life of Americans" are stressed. The approaching conflict between North and South furnishes the thread with which an amazing number and variety of subjects are bound into unity. The point of view is that suggested by the title. Two divergent social-economic systems were drifting inevitably into civil war.

Professor Cole has done neither better nor worse than his fellow authors in accomplishing the difficult task of writing history by leaving out the things which an "old-fashioned historian" would have included. He has had to select his materials from an abundant store and the impression given is sometimes that of a welter of facts chosen because of convenience or personal interest, not because they are essential to a well-balanced picture of American life as a continuous whole. Certain regions furnish more than their share of illustrations; the South is depicted very much as the abolitionist would have had it; the "irrepressible" character of the struggle between the sections is taken quite too much for granted. Yet, in spite of defects, the work does give the sound impression of a people busily at work and play, while unbeknownst to themselves, they were drifting toward disaster.

Daily life in the 1850's was highly complex. A new era in transportation, both by land and sea, was well under way. The West, with its lure of land and minerals, was being rapidly settled by native and foreign groups. The industrial revolution was transforming New England; commerce, the Eastern cities; and cotton was building its kingdom in the South.

Professor Cole's narrative of each of these major developments is compact and interesting. Roads and railroads, steam and clipper ships brought new

speed and comfort in travel and hurried the growth of the trans-Mississippi West. Cheap and efficient methods in manufacturing permitted the American factory to more than hold its own against foreign competition. Speculation of all kinds reached new levels and added to the impression that "dollar worshipping" was a national trait. Prosperity, followed by "irrepressible" depression, characterized the fifties, as midwestern farmers, using new machinery and better methods, piled the nation's food supply beyond domestic needs. A great and generally prosperous North was prepared to face its Southern rival.

Meanwhile, down in "Dixie", as Professor Cole usually calls the South, conditions were not as satisfactory. The lines between classes, in an already stratified society, grew harder and the interests of "aristocrats" and "poor whites", who seem to have made up these classes, diverged. Slavery destroyed the soils, free Negroes became a menace, and the section, ever conscious of its growing inferiority, turned all its efforts to defending slavery and restoring the sectional balance.

Closely woven with the economic story is that of the social developments which accompanied material growth. Foreign immigrants poured in to share opportunities with the native-born and to create the problems of assimilation and tolerance. Labor became conscious of the evils in youthful industry. Morality, security, and health were endangered by urban growth as gambling, prostitution, intemperance, and divorce increased. Public education, new means of relaxation, and a reordering of the Church's outlook all made progress—while a group of more or less talented writers and artists vied with reformers, who would cure all our "growing pains", for public support.

Such chapters as those on "Health and Happiness", "Education and Cultural Advance", and "The Challenge to the Church" are "catch-alls" for a wide variety of interesting and usually valuable materials. Yet one looks in vain for a clear understanding of the interrelation of economic-social forces in producing the Republican party in the Northwest or the abolition movement in the Northeast. The deeper currents which ran through the American mind in this period are still uncharted.

The last five chapters in the book are supposed to "illuminate" the causes of civil war and to reveal a people at war. There are interesting "everyday" materials regarding the hardships of conscientious objectors, the use of propaganda by both sides, and more than the usual emphasis on the part played by profiteers behind the lines. The center of interest is not at the front, but "back home"—and Professor Cole has given a good picture of the farmers, the womenfolk, and of those who kept the "home-fires burning". He has not made a real contribution to the understanding of secession or the reasons why a people had to resort to war to settle sectional differences no greater than those existing at different times between East and West. He has missed most

of the significant things in the abolition movement. He has failed to justify the title of his book. He has left as uncertain as before the "irrepressible" character of the War between the States.

The University of Chicago. AVERY CRAVEN.

The Comanche Barrier to South Plains Settlement: a Century and a Half of Savage Resistance to the Advancing White Frontier. By RUPERT NORVAL RICHARDSON, Professor of History, Simmons University. (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Company. 1933. Pp. 424, $6.00.)

THIS volume is one of the most comprehensive historical studies that has been made thus far of any tribe of Indians of the United States. It is the most thorough historical study yet made of one of the eleven typical Plains tribes. By example of his work, the author challenges the historians of other Plains states to write similar accounts of the Kiowa-Apache, Cheyenne, Arapaho, Teton-Dakota, Crow, Assiniboin, Blackfoot, Blood, Piegan, and other Western tribes. When this has been done, the story of the struggle of the white men with the Plains Indians will be fairly complete.

That the tasks suggested will be difficult is obvious to anyone who examines what Mr. Richardson has done. The historian of the Indians, and especially of the Plains tribes, is faced with the necessity of writing about people who left no records save such as were made by their enemies. By the time—in fact, long before—the Comanches learned to write their history was over. Consequently the author is confined to treating of relations between the Indian and his white enemies. This is what Mr. Richardson has done.

After a brief and interesting chapter on the tribe, its organization, divisions, social customs, and religion, the author takes up the contact of the Comanches with the Spaniards in the early eighteenth century. The story moves forward to about 1874 when the remnant bands were reduced to a state of complete dependence on the Federal government. In the eighteenth century the Comanches have been estimated to number from ten to twenty thousand; in 1926 the number had fallen to less than eighteen hundred. The figures tell briefly the results of the Indian's struggle with the white man.

From the records in the Indian office at Washington and from many sources found in Texas, the story of the Comanches is told. In many respects it is a record of the Texas frontier, for the Texans had most of their troubles with the Comanches, and the Comanches had most of theirs with the Texans. A careful search has failed to reveal the omission by the author of any important incident connected with Comanche history up to 1874. The failure to discuss the organization of the Frontier Battalion under Major John B. Jones in 1874, and the work of the Ranger captains for two years thereafter, might be mentioned; but the omission, when viewed in perspective, is not important. On page 371 it is implied that the Texas Rangers "dealt severely"

with the Indians in the winter of 1873–1874. At that time the carpetbag governor, E. J. Davis, was the executive, and there were no Indian fighters in Texas that could legitimately be called Texas Rangers. The Frontier Battalion of Texas Rangers was not organized before May and June of 1874, after the Texans had regained control of their government.

The severest criticism that I can offer on this thorough and scholarly work is Mr. Richardson's failure to show, as clearly as he might have done, the terrible results of the so-called reconstruction on the Indian situation in Texas. The Federal government would not permit the Texans to organize the Rangers for their own defense. The Federal soldiers, many of whom were Negroes, were inadequate for the protection of the frontier; and the State Police, instead of hunting Indians as the Rangers had done, and were to do later, spent their time in the settlements guarding the polls, carrying the elections for the Republicans, and, incidentally, getting themselves killed off for meddling with 'whitefolk's' affairs. While the Federal government pressed the military heel down on the Texans, it turned the Indians over to the sentimental, though well-meaning Quakers who tried to rule them with kindness. The Quaker policy was as inadequate in dealing with Comanches as the 'thee's' and 'thou's' of the Quaker's reports were obsolescent.

The history of the Comanches is written with sympathy and impartiality. The text and nearly all the 767 footnotes together with a complete bibliography furnish information and sources for all students whose studies deal with the Southwest frontier prior to 1880. The whole tone of the book is scientific, and nowhere has the author sought to produce effects not warranted by the facts. By preserving a fine sense of proportion, he has been able to present a connected account of practically every known historical episode associated with one of the most formidable, and doubtless one of the least compromising, tribes of Indians found on the North American continent. Three maps show the Comanche country in 1840, 1860, and 1875; and a fourth shows the trails that the Indians made on their raids into Mexico at about the middle of the nineteenth century. In addition there are six illustrations from drawings or photographs.

The excellent format and general appearance of the volume may best be described by giving the name of the publisher, Arthur H. Clark. The heavy paper and large clear type give the book dimensions and weight out of proportion to the length of the text.

The University of Texas. WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB.

Church and State in Latin America: a History of Politico-Ecclesiastical Relations. By J. LLOYD MECHAM, Ph. D., Professor of Government, The University of Texas. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1934. Pp. viii, 550. $4.50.)

A History of the Church in Venezuela, 1810–1930. By MARY WATTERS, Ph. D., Professor of History and Government, Arkansas State College. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1933. Pp. ix, 260. $3.00.)

PROFESSOR Mecham pictures the historical evolution of the Church throughout Latin America, that is, its adaptation of the forms of Spanish, French, and Portuguese autocracy to the American milieu, and the processes whereby the colonial institution has been modified in the development of the social and political ideal in nineteen Latin American countries. He has made no effort to write church history nor to discuss problems of dogma. But it is important to have an analysis of the causes of present day anti-clericalism in these southern republics, as there must be some common basis for the widely manifested phenomenon of general loss of prestige in nearly all the countries concerned. The case of Mexico is of especial interest to Americans, and the impression exists that in it the Church has had harsher treatment than elsewhere—a statement not borne out by the facts.

During the colonial régime and the revolution all the areas had practically identical experiences; the Church dominated the social and political, as well as the economic picture; after independence, though there had been general recognition of this dominance, there came a gradual breaking away from clerical control. The early attacks upon the Church in politics came under the guise of abolition of the tithes, suppression of monastic orders, and confiscation of properties in vengeance for exercise of political power or for failure to win success in elections during the republican era. The beginning was probably in most cases when the congresses attempted to exercise the *patronato* in place of the king after separation from the mother country. The story becomes then one of the attempts in Latin America to evolve toward the practice of self-government by the mass—a step on the path toward democracy. In Mexico the constitutional restrictions and legal practice point to elimination of the Church from political and social influence of any kind. In Argentina, Columbia, and Peru, much of the old clerical position remains intact, whereas, in Chile, Cuba, Panama, and Uruguay the Church has a position quite analogous to that which it enjoys among us.

Professor Watters has given a very similar treatment of the single instance of Venezuela. She points out, as does Dr. Mecham, that the varying shifts from political domination reflect the individualism of the several entities. As elsewhere, the Venezuelan clergy began to lose influence through abuses against the natives and by the refusal to march with the progress of intellectual life. Though many priests espoused the revolution this created less antagonism than did their participation in the post-independence rivalries. Since the revolution the Church has declined in intellectual respect and social power, most of the intelligentsia regarding this as a matter for congratulation.

Both writers discuss their problems without bias. They have observed the canons of historical writing—both of them implicitly assuming that there was no other alternative open to the conquerors but the imposition of their religion, which is possibly true.

The University of California. HERBERT I. PRIESTLEY.

The Background of the Revolution for Mexican Independence. By LILLIAN ESTELLE FISHER, Ph. D., Associate Professor of History in Oklahoma College for Women. (Boston: Christopher Publishing House. 1934. Pp. 512. $4.00.)

THE conditions which served as the setting for independence are described in ten long chapters, based largely on contemporary sources. The conventional causes for discontent are given in the summary of each chapter and in the conclusion. The growing resentment and friction because of class distinction, especially between Creoles and Peninsulars, and the degraded position of the Indians; the inadequate and restricted educational opportunities, controlled by the Church, but dangerously supplemented by foreign ideas and illicit literature; the unprogressive and narrow economic policy which resulted in smuggling, teaching both colonials and foreigners the advantages of independence; and burdensome and confiscatory taxes—such were the causes for discontent. Even the Church, the most powerful of the colonial institutions, lost prestige because of the decadence caused by wealth, the irritating restrictions of the Inquisition, and the class conflict among the clergy. The colonial government lacked flexibility and was characterized by overregulation from Spain and procrastination in the colony. Reforms seldom eliminated the evils and gave no evidence of increased loyalty. As the duties and responsibilities became greater, the personnel became inferior. The revolutionary influence from England, France, and the United States is considered significant. Sixteen pages are devoted to the French and only one to the British, whereas their influences were more nearly equal. Activities of the United States on the borderland are emphasized, but the Burr episode is neglected. While Napoleon's activities are mentioned there is no recognition of the change in his policy from seeking allegiance to promoting revolution. Finally, the calling of juntas for consultation during the Peninsular War served the double function of accentuating the rift between Americans and Peninsulars, and in stimulating interest in self-government.

Much space is devoted to contemporary opinions, but they lack analysis and evaluation and the reader is left with a mass of conflicting statements. For example, when Lizana speaks of the Creoles and Peninsulars as brothers and of the fact that rivalry would be impossible (p. 25), he surely must be expressing a pious hope rather than a fact. Nor do the author's generalizations always fit the factual material which she presents. They are often

generous in their praise, while most of the data appear to contradict them. The reforms of Charles III, she says, "did accomplish good results for the colonies, making it possible for Spain to hold its distant possessions for another half century" (p. 260). There is no evidence to show that the colonies would have gained their independence a half century earlier without these reforms. On the contrary, there is evidence to show that the reforms were of little significance (pp. 350, 413), and they have been considered as "the first step toward Mexican emancipation" (p. 103).

The preface states that this work ends with the beginning of the hidalgo revolt, but much material is devoted to the revolutionary period, which may be desirable, except for the statistical material which is generally given without explaining that the conditions were not normal during that time.

As a piece of bookmaking this work leaves much to be desired; many pages show an uneven distribution of ink; letters are frequently blurred, particularly footnote numbers; and the work contains over fifty typographical errors.

Evidence of the author's great industry is seen in the imposing list of manuscripts cited in the bibliography (32 pp.). She has leaned heavily, however, on such great contemporaries as Revillagigedo, Humboldt, and Abad y Queipo, the last being her favorite. Eleven items used were omitted in the bibliography. The book has a very good index.

The Municipal University of Wichita. JOHN RYDJORD.

Contribución al estudio de la guerra federal en Venezuela. Por DR. JOSÉ SANTIAGO RODRÍGUEZ, de la Academia nacional de la historia y de la de ciencias politicas y sociales. Dos tomos. (Caracas: Editorial "Elite". 1933. Pp. 448, 439.)

THIS "Contribution to the Study of the Federal War in Venezuela", written by the lawyer, scholar, and gentleman, Dr. José Santiago Rodríguez, is based upon a rich archive left by his grandfather of the same name. The elder Rodríguez was diplomatic representative in Europe during the first three years of the war (1859–1864) and received letters from leaders of both parties, especially from Conservatives. Returning, he occupied high office and participated in efforts at conciliation. These letters, together with many documents, have come to the writer as an archive almost exclusively inedited. The volumes, containing much source material, are a valuable and significant addition to the works of Juan Vicente González, José María de Rojas, Level de Goda, Lisandro Alvarado, Alfonzo, Arcaya, Gil Fortoul, and Vallenilla Lanz.

The author's approach to the difficult problem of interpretation is through the media of psychology and sociology. The works of Sighele, Taine, and Le Bon have on him, as on Venezuelan public thought and historiography, a powerful influence. Indeed, the author sees in the letters and documents

reproduced an aid to those who would "penetrate the psychology of the epoch" (I, 12). These influences are manifest in the analysis and evaluation of the causes of the war, which are favorite themes of speculation and controversy in Venezuela.

The two most important factors in causing the war, according to this writer, were: first, the subversion produced by the wars of independence in the political, social, and economic order; and, secondly, the effects of the propaganda, 1840–1846, upon an anarchic and illiterate proletarian class inducing that class to think of those in power (the "Conservative Oligarchy" or "Godos") as continuing the Spanish system. Other causes entered, such as the agitation of demagogues and journalists for a vaguely idealized liberty and equality; race hatred; invocation of the name of Bolívar; collapse of the prestige of Páez and later that of Monagas; the progressively increasing anarchy, a condition which enabled the criminal to pose as a political insurrectionist (I, 88), and which allowed the landowner to keep only "what the robbers were willing to leave him" (I, 95); the relaxation of morals and respect for law; and the personal hatred of leaders for each other. Combustibles were thus accumulated, ready for conflagration.

It is well known that the so-called Conservative party was instrumental in overthrowing the Monagas dynasty and in writing the constitution of 1858. An important contribution is made in showing the inharmonious elements of this party. The indictment is that it was composed of brilliant individualists, who were desirous in one way or another of establishing the reign of law; but their energies were "hermetically sealed within the law" (I, 344), which itself needed to be imposed forcefully, even if the imposition involved a breach of the law. Of the much contemned president, Julián Castro, it is said "the man cannot be the ruler (*conductor*) of the destinies of a people who does not command, but who consults; he who does not give the impulse, but receives it" (I, 348). The letters record a surprising comprehension of the social issues and of his own dilemma. This dilemma was essentially that dictatorial action would lose him the support of the legalists, whereas conciliatory and legal methods would lose the war. The Conservatives were to run a gamut of experimentation—a soldier, advised by civilians to the point of vacillation; civilian governments which had to employ soldiers, but did not trust them; and, finally, a military dictatorship headed by the elderly Páez, whose power was that of force *per se,* not of prestige. "The government of the Dictatorship sought to be energetic, but neither knew how to be nor could be . . ." (II, 365). No one of these experiments rested upon a sufficient unity or developed a sustained policy. These volumes are relatively more significant with respect to the Conservatives and their problems, financial, diplomatic, political, and military.

The Federalist cause is represented as a sort of hydra, with new heads

appearing in place of those struck off. Social anarchy, guerrilla tactics, and dissension within the Conservative party made for the ultimate triumph of the Federalists.

Of what avail to Venezuela were these years of frightful civil war? The brilliant interpretative and concluding chapter strikes on this question a despondent note. Terrorism, social insecurity, enrichment from partisan despoliation were to continue as disturbing factors in Venezuelan life and politics. And with them was to continue the riddle of the traditional Venezuelan parties. The second volume closes with a quotation from a statement made by the Licenciado José Santiago Rodríguez in 1859: "Civil war has begun in Venezuela: we shall not see its ending: may God will that our children see it" (II, 439).

The University of North Carolina. WILLIAM WHATLEY PIERSON, JR.

SHORTER NOTICES

Aspects of Athenian Democracy. By Robert J. Bonner, Professor of Greek in the University of Chicago. [Sather Classical Lectures, Volume XI.] (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1934, pp. 199, $2.25.) In the first chapter of this book the development of Athenian democracy is traced from the earliest times to its logical perfection in the fifth century. This is perhaps the most interesting part of the book. Each of the other chapters depicts carefully the aspect of democracy to which it is devoted: the judiciary, the politicians, freedom of speech, and citizenship. In chapter VI the importance of oratory is duly emphasized. The book contains little or nothing new, nor are the points of view presented either novel or striking. Occasionally there is brief discussion of some detail, as on page 129, where the author contends (against Hirzel) that "dialogue could find no real place in oratory. The reproduction of conversations in forensic speech is done rather from a desire to give a dramatic touch to the incident related"; but in general facts are stated without argument, and only seldom is there a hint of possible doubt (*e.g.*, p. 88, on the military training of the youth).

The author knows his subject and has produced a book which should be of great service to those who wish to become acquainted with the development and methods of Athenian democracy; and those who are already familiar with Athenian history may read with profit this clear and well ordered presentation of some of its most essential elements.

The Library of Congress. HAROLD N. FOWLER.

Life and Letters in the Papyri. By John Garrett Winter. [University of Michigan Studies, The Jerome Lectures.] (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1933, pp. vii, 308, $3.50.) Professor Winter has written "for

those who are not specialists" an admirable general introduction to papyri and related material, with especial emphasis upon four topics of particular interest: Rome and Romans in the Papyri, the everyday life of the people, evidences of Christianity in the private letters, and the more important additions to Greek and Latin literature. Originally prepared as Thomas Spencer Jerome Lectures, first delivered before the American Academy in Rome in 1929, under the requirement to present, "in not too technical form, some phase of [the lecturer's] study of ancient life and society", these chapters very properly pay relatively little attention to a number of matters which a systematic philological introduction to papyrology would necessarily cover. But, within the limits set, this graceful and persuasive essay, the fruit of mature and well proportioned scholarship, is independent, vivid, touched occasionally with a dry and pleasant humor, fully abreast of the latest advances of research in every department, and containing so many acute and important contributions to texts and interpretations that even the most advanced specialist will find much to learn. No fewer than twenty-eight papyri are critically discussed, some of them at considerable length, while thirty-four unpublished papyri in the Michigan collection are utilized, often somewhat fully. Particularly admirable are the full bibliographies, and there are four carefully prepared indexes.

Only a few small points suggest further comment. Thus in a work dealing so extensively with the influences of Christianity I should have expected considerably more attention to the fascinating questions raised by the *Logia* of Jesus, as well as something more on the earliest specifically Christian literature. The treatment of Christian influences is perhaps a little too favorable. There are indeed many points of difference between the contents of the earlier and those of the later papyri, but it is hardly fair to give Christianity credit for all of the good and none of the evil also, I mean the passionate vehemence, the swearing and cursing, the obsequiousness, the verbosity, the triviality, and the generally lowered levels of intellectual and æsthetic culture, which the later documents display. Something more might well have been done also to explain the large number of strange or technical terms which give the papyri such an unfamiliar appearance to the beginner. It is perhaps only an oversight that the most famous Roman estates in Egypt, those of the philosopher Seneca, are not mentioned in the discussion of that topic. Insufficient cognizance is occasionally given, I think, to the fact that the legal documents are commonly quite *ex parte* statements.

But these are the merest trifles in a book of unusual and varied merits, that is fully the equal, where direct comparison is reasonable, of Wilhelm Schubart's well-known essays at their best.

The University of Illinois. W. A. Oldfather.

Le monde féodal. Par Joseph Calmette, membre de l'Institut, professeur à la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Toulouse. ["Clio": Introduction aux études historiques, 4.] (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1934, pp. lii, 490, 30 fr.) This "companion to medieval studies" is merely a detailed, one-volume text of general medieval history (476–1300) with extensive bibliographical material. Despite the expectations aroused by the title, it is not a description of feudal society. Only two chapters are descriptive; one, of feudalism, the other of Christian institutions. The rest is political history, treated chronologically and heavily charged with proper names, dates, topical and paragraph headings. Several of the author's interpretations may be questioned, notably the Germanophobia that crops out in two places. The struggle of Charlemagne's successors for control of Lotharingia (pp. 116 ff., 124 f.) is flavored with expressions such as "Louis the German . . . violated the neutrality of Lorraine"; and the French Carolingians "bravely disputed German ambitions in Lorraine". In like manner, the papal-imperial conflicts (pp. 131 ff.) are interpreted as brutal German aggressions against papal idealism. Emperor Henry III (usually credited with a much needed reform of a corrupt three-headed papacy) appears here as a "usurper", "brutal" and "furious". Henry IV, also, is "false", "brutal", "a schemer"; whereas his papal opponent, Gregory VII, "is no politician", but a true "pastor", who seeks only religious reform. Even the "Canossa" episode proves that "Gregory is not a politician". Apparently M. Calmette, like M. Fliche whose conclusions he accepts without question (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 92), believes that Gregory died in exile because he "loved justice and hated iniquity". This equating of the emperor's worst political practices with the pope's highest ideals is neither fair play nor good history. But later emperors are tarred with the same stick; and of all the popes, only Boniface VIII is permitted to have "a passionate, imperious, temperament", and a "politique". In other respects, M. Calmette's work is sound. There are brilliant descriptions, stimulating analogies (*e.g.*, Widukind as the Vercingetorix of Saxony), and effective organization of masses of detail. Errors are rare, and unimportant (the date of Isidore's death, p. 35; *Mehaut* instead of *Brehaut*, p. 36, a strange citation of Joranson's book, p. 51, etc.). The bibliographical portions of the book are excellent. The introductory chapter has able discussions of sources, with lists of books, and even of historical journals. Each chapter has a lengthy appendix (sometimes over twenty pages of fine print) containing critical comments on both primary and secondary sources, and observations on the "État actuel des questions". These observations (like the bibliographical references with which the text is liberally sprinkled) might better be merged with the critical bibliographies, or relegated to footnotes. For American medievalists these critical, up-to-date bibliographies should be of real value. The general textual matter is not as

complete as that of the *Cambridge Medieval History*, and is less usable than many of our own textbooks.

The University of North Carolina. LOREN C. MACKINNEY.

Self-Government at the King's Command: a Study in the Beginnings of English Democracy. By Albert Beebe White, Professor of History, University of Minnesota. (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1933, pp. 130, $2.50.) The value of this little book consists in the broad generalization which its author makes and then amply proves by a host of specific instances. It is a generalization which may at first sight seem strange to the laymen or to one nourished only by the older textbooks, but one to which most scholars would now subscribe. The older generation of historians of medieval England labored under the preconception that England's unique contribution to self-government could only be explained as the unfolding of principles of English liberty which come down in unbroken sequence from the free institutions of the primitive Germanic tribes. This study is based on a belief, not reached *a priori*, but as a result of years of study in contemporary documents, that English self-government is the outcome not so much of inherent characteristics as of historical causes, and chief among these causes, of the strong and unified administrative system built up by the Norman kings and their early Angevin successors and made effective by drafting the services of local men who thus in time came up to Parliament with a background of long political experience gained in the county court. In short, self-government in England, local and later central, rests on a solid foundation of royal administration which in time became truly national because of the people's obligation enforced by royal authority to assist in this administration. This is Professor White's thesis, proved conclusively by numberless instances drawn from the mass of available printed records, chiefly judicial in character. His book is an admirable demonstration of a sound thesis, the by-product of many years of careful research.

C. H. M.

Bishops and Reform, 1215–1272, with Special Reference to the Lateran Council of 1215. By Marion Gibbs and Jane Lang. [Oxford Historical Series.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1934, pp. viii, 216, $4.25.) The English Church, at the close of King John's disastrous reign, was in obvious need of reform, but the English episcopate had for guidance in this task the comprehensive reform program which the Lateran Council of 1215 had enacted for the Church as a whole. To what an extent was this program carried out in England between the years 1215 and 1272? Miss Lang, in answer to this question, describes the introduction of the Lateran decrees, and concludes that no systematic attempt was made by the English episcopate

either to promulgate these decrees or to carry out a real reform of the Church. With but few exceptions, she declares, the English bishops failed to grasp the fundamental purpose of the decrees; slight effort was made to prevent members of the clergy from holding secular offices, and as a result the English Church by 1272 was more materialistic than it had been in 1215.

The enforcement of the Lateran decrees would depend to a considerable degree upon the attitude of the English bishops of the period. Miss Gibbs, in her study, throws some light on their training and character, and also investigates the extent to which the personnel of the episcopate was affected by the influence exerted over elections by "Pope, Legate, King, or magnate". Although Miss Gibbs comments upon the lack of evidence available upon which to base conclusions she seems to have made little use of the unpublished sources for the period, or even of the papal registers and published cartularies of religious houses. This same consideration also affects the finality of the conclusions reached by Miss Lang. Even though these studies be regarded as essentially introductory in character they are carefully written and well documented, and their authors have performed a useful service in helping to illuminate a critical period of English Church history.

The University of Rochester. HUGH MACKENZIE.

The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia from the Time of Muhammad till the Fourteenth Century. By Laurence E. Browne, B.D., Henry Martyn School of Islamics, Lahore. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. 198, $3.50.) The author has here given us a competent survey of a large section of the most serious geographic loss which Christianity has ever been called upon to meet. Not even the Russian Revolution of our generation deprived the Church of so large a proportion of its membership as did Islam. Most of this loss was in Asia, although the Church also suffered severely in North Africa, Spain, and Southeastern Europe, areas which, except for some references to Egypt, Professor Browne does not attempt to cover. The book concerns itself chiefly with Nestorianism, which in the end was reduced to a mere shadow of its former strength. It is based upon independent study of some of the pertinent Arabic texts and upon extensive reading in the literature in German, French, and English. The author, as a missionary, quite naturally writes from the standpoint of his profession. In the main, however, he preserves excellent objectivity. We still need to know more than he tells us of the experience of some of the churches other than the Nestorian. Nor, although he has illuminating and discerning comments to make on the subject, does Professor Browne make entirely clear the reasons for the fate of Nestorianism. He has, however, given us the best summary in English of the topic to which he has set his hand.

Yale University. K. S. LATOURETTE.

La châtellenie et la ville de Sarreguemines de 1335 à 1630. Par Henri Charles Hiegel, licencié ès lettres, diplômé d'études supérieures d'histoire et de géographie. Préface de M. André Gain, professeur à la Faculté des lettres de Nancy. [Annales de l'Est, publiées par la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Nancy, Mémoires, No. 3.] (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1934, pp. xlvii, 543, 40 fr.) This book has the characteristic virtues and defects of a monograph devoted to local history. The author has searched for his material with commendable zeal, for the most part in the departmental archives of the Meurthe-et-Moselle and the Moselle, in the communal archives of Sarreguemines, in the public libraries of Nancy and Metz, and in the great printed collections. He has equipped his book with maps, tables, diagrams, drawings, an excellent index of names and places, a critical bibliography of sources, a lengthy *avant-propos* by himself and a laudatory preface by his master, Professor André Gain. The political history of the *châtellenie* and the *ville* to 1630, with sufficient emphasis upon the period before 1335, fills the first quarter of the volume; the remaining pages are devoted to the institutions of the *châtellenie* and the *ville* from 1335 to 1630. This second portion is by far the better. In it will be found, in addition to the normal subdividisions of the topic, an excellent picture of the civilizing rôle of the Church in the Middle Ages as measured by its political, economic, social, intellectual, moral, and religious activities in this area. The net result of the whole book, however, is not very satisfactory. It is too long, too detailed, too diffuse, and too patriotic. Even the conclusion, obviously meant to be summary in nature, runs to excessive length and lacks both clarity and force. Students of medieval institutional history will find a great deal of interesting and important information in this book but they will regret, with the reviewer, that the author did not rewrite his manuscript before publication, in half the space and with more stress upon the elucidation of selected fundamental factors and trends of development.

Smith College. SIDNEY R. PACKARD.

Die Entwicklung Österreich-Ungarns zur Grossmacht. Von Dr. Hugo Hantsch, Privatdozent an der Universität Wien. *Der Aufstieg Brandenburg-Preussens, 1640 bis 1815.* Von Dr. Max Braubach, Professor an der Universität Bonn. [Geschichte der führenden Völker.] (Freiburg i. B., St. Louis, B. Herder Book Company, 1933, pp. viii, 382, $3.00.)

Der deutsche Staat: Verfassung, Macht, und Grenzen, 919–1914. Von Aloys Schulte. (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1933, pp. 514, 14 M.) Dr. Hantsch in a concisely written narrative of less than two hundred pages traces practically the whole history of the Austrian state. His work begins with the Babenbergers and ends with Francis I. This short treatise will be useful to the student of the nineteenth century, not for its recital of the dynastic history of central Europe, but because it presents, conveniently, the

history of the changing status of the Hapsburgs with reference to Bohemia, Hungary, and other lands. Dr. Hantsch describes in detail the shift of interest from empire to state since the time of Maria Theresa. In fact the disintegration of the Holy Roman Empire and the triumph of the *Einheitsstaat* dominate the latter half of the work.

Dr. Braubach's field, the expansion of Brandenburg-Prussia, is more familiar to the American student. Treating a shorter period, 1640–1815, the author is enabled to exploit his subject more completely than Hantsch. Moreover, though constitutional and diplomatic history necessarily form the main themes, Braubach's excursion into the economic and cultural aspects of Prussian history is more than casual. Both authors have written up-to-date bibliographies and, although the Geschichte der führenden Völker series is intended for the general reader, the student will be impressed by the freshness of treatment arising from the use of recently published materials.

Dr. Schulte, professor emeritus of Bonn and an investigator in the field of German history for nearly a half century, undertakes in a work of considerable magnitude to trace the varying fortunes of the political experience of the German people since the accession of Henry I. Although nearly half the volume is devoted to the period since the French Revolution, the student is likely to find the first portion which treats of the evolution of the Holy Roman Empire the more interesting. Dr. Schulte analyzes the factors and influences which for many centuries prevented the attainment of a satisfactory political organism by the German people. Much of the subject matter is political history dealing with succession struggles and the connection with the papacy. A large part of the volume is concerned with territorial expansion and with the relations of affiliated districts to the Empire. Throughout the work, however, constitutional development is stressed. During the early period central and local administration, judicial and financial institutions, and military organization receive topical treatment. In the later period dealing with the leadership of Prussia, the North German Confederation, and the *Kaiserreich,* the changing constitutional structure absorbs much of the author's attention.

Princeton University. J. E. Pomfret.

Correspondance de la Cour d'Espagne sur les affaires des Pays-Bas au XVII^e siècle. Tome IV, *Précis de la correspondance de Philippe IV, 1647–1665.* Par Joseph Cuvelier avec la collaboration de Joseph Lefèvre.

Itinéraires de Marie de Bourgoygne et de Maximilian d'Autriche, 1477–1482. Par Herman Vander Linden. [Académie royale de Belgique, Commission royale d'histoire.] (Brussels, Maurice Lamertin, 1933; 1934, pp. xv, 875; xiv, 125.) The first title continues the digests of letters passed between the Spanish court and its representatives in the Spanish, or Southern

Low Countries. The first three volumes of this set were published in 1923, 1927, and 1933. This volume covers the years 1647 to 1665, a most stirring epoch in the history of Europe, for within this brief space there were such notable events as the Treaty of Westphalia, Cromwell's régime in England, the Treaty of the Pyrenees, and the Stuart Restoration. It was the period of Dutch ascendancy in European politics which involved many economic, political, and military questions. No serious student of the seventeenth century can afford to overlook the precious material contained in this volume.

Professor Vander Linden's study of the activities of Mary of Burgundy and Maximilian of Austria during the five eventful years after the death of Charles the Rash in 1477 has made possible this useful itinerary of the two youthful sovereigns from 1477 to 1482. Each day of this entire period is indicated and references from printed and unprinted documents are given. The *annexes* contain the itinerary of Maximilian from Vienna to Bruges in 1477, and the relation of the journey from Cologne to Bruges.

The University of Washington. HENRY S. LUCAS.

Heilige und Heiligenlegenden in England: Studien zum 16. und 17. Jahrhundert. Von Rudolf Kapp. Band I. (Halle/Saale, Max Niemeyer, 1934, pp. xiii, 371, 14 M.) Some twenty years ago Professor G. H. Gerould wrote a volume on saints' legends considered as a type of English literature. It dealt almost entirely with the medieval period, but in a concluding chapter covered the period of the Reformation and modern times. Now a German scholar has undertaken to treat the Tudor-Stuart phase of this subject in greater detail. The event on which all turns is, of course, the Reformation. In the course of that great revolution Humanist, monarch, and extreme Protestant, each from his own point of view, attacked the cult of the saints. But in spite of the opposition this literature was not altogether stamped out. After eliminating some of the incredible material Catholic writers continued to circulate these stories. Simultaneously the Puritans developed a hagiography of their own. Most important of all, Elizabeth favored a moderate use of such tales, expurgated and adapted to the Anglican ethical concepts. So the legends found a place in popular Elizabethan chronicles and poetry. Spenser, the last writer considered in this volume, likewise incorporated some of them in his *Faerie Queene,* which therefore seems to the author a fundamentally Catholic production.

The old questions of the interpretation of Spenser's work and the determination of his theological attitude we may leave to students of literature. The author is writing mainly for them, and makes no effort to evaluate the historical worth of the materials of which he treats. Nevertheless the historian will be interested in his explanation of how the development of new ideals among the Humanists, Anglicans, and Puritans contributed more to the

decline of hagiology than did the demand for truth as such. There seems to be some confusion in his characterization of the Puritans, who frequently (*e.g.*, pp. 162–166) are presented as credulous of miracles but in one important passage (pp. 346–347) are described as rationalistic. The former is undoubtedly the correct representation, and where the other is presented it serves to weaken the generally sound argument of the volume that Anglican and Puritan writings are to be distinguished by their attitude toward saints' legends. For this difference was one of value judgment rather than critical acumen. The Puritan might prefer Piers Plowman to St. George as an ideal. But he also considered it quite reasonable that protectors of true believers should be rewarded with boy babies after years of barrenness, while persecutors were shortly eaten alive by vermin.

The University of Chicago. M. M. KNAPPEN.

The Unknown Cromwell. By F. H. Hayward, D. Lit., M. A., B. Sc. (London, George Allen and Unwin, 1934, pp. 384, 12*s.* 6*d.*) Under this curious title Mr. Hayward has written a series of chapters with headings which reveal his approach to his subject. "Libel, Suppression and Bewilderment", "Limitations and Prejudices", "The Field of Bannockburn: a Reverie", "Persecution, Knight-Errantry, War", indicate the character of a thoroughgoing, uncritical, passionate defense of Cromwell and of Puritanism. It is based on the curious fallacy, as expressed in the preface, that "the ordinary fate of an eminent man is to call forth general agreement as to ability, character and motives and some disagreement on a few or unimportant details". If there is one thing in the world which is not the "ordinary fate of an eminent man" it is this. If there is one thing in the world which Cromwell is not, it is "unknown". Directed against Stirling Taylor's and Belloc's recent volumes, this is, as the author frankly admits, not merely polemical but sermonizing. As history it is, of course, not to be considered seriously; it may even be questioned whether it may be regarded as helping Cromwell's cause; for to one at all familiar with the seventeenth century every page of the defense proper offers ground for disagreement almost, if not quite, as vehement as the defense itself.

W. C. A.

Leibniz und die Friedensschlüsse von Utrecht und Rastatt-Baden. Von Dr. P. Fransen. (Purmerend, J. Muusses, 1933, pp. 240, 3 fr. 90.) The title of this book is somewhat unfortunate, as it deals but little with the treaties mentioned. There is little about the Treaty of Utrecht, as Leibnitz's attempts to secure its repudiation and a continuation of the war came to nothing. His hostility to the treaties of Rastatt-Baden, as set forth in his letters and tracts, published and unpublished, likewise came to naught. After a critical exami-

nation of most of the available materials on this phase of the career of Leibnitz, both printed and in manuscript, the author concludes that the rôle played by the philosopher in politics and diplomacy has been exaggerated. A study of his letters, printed tracts, and a large number of other drafts, unpublished, but sent to persons of outstanding importance, leads Dr. Fransen to feel that Leibnitz was never in the confidence of the emperor, or his influential advisers; that no one at the Hanoverian court, save the Electress Dowager, Sophia, and her friends, placed any reliance in him, whereas at the Prussian court he was suspect; and that even the czar cultivated him only in the vain hope of gaining through him the emperor's ear. The author also believes that Leibnitz made false claims as to his confidential relations with persons in authority, although your reviewer prefers to believe that the philosopher actually deluded himself into thinking that he stood higher in the estimation of the mighty than he did.

Dr. Fransen also reaches two other conclusions: (1) that there was little in the suggestions set forth by Leibnitz that was original or significant which could not be found more skillfully stated in the writings of his contemporaries, notably Baron de Lisola and Jean Dumont; (2) that many, if not most, of his more important suggestions were highly impractical, and indicated the scholar's lack of a practical knowledge of politics and economics. In short, life for Leibnitz was one long disappointment, for he never quite attained fame in the political realm, and gradually he aroused the distrust of his influential associates, because of his confusion of purpose, and his unfortunate choice of confidential friends.

The book is a good piece of historical scholarship. At times the author seems unduly critical of earlier workers in the field, and occasionally the style seems a bit labored. An index would have been most welcome, and the bibliography, by judicious annotations, would have been much more useful.

Indiana University. WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN.

Lafayette, a Revolutionary Gentleman. By Michael de la Bedoyere. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934, pp. 316, $3.00.) This book is written in a style which, though too frequently marred both by banality and patent straining for originality, often achieves charm and profundity. It is also characterized by an intuitive understanding of Lafayette's character and psychology, which have too seldom been apprehended by his numerous other biographers. These two accomplishments of the author might have resulted in the composition of a good biographical study, were it not for another necessary factor in regard to which the author is lamentably deficient. Mr. de la Bedoyere knows surprisingly little about the period during which Lafayette lived. His reading has been haphazard. He has believed good as

well as bad testimony, and in at least one case has accepted as evidence some obviously spurious letters. He has quite often only repeated other writers' mistakes, but more frequently has committed perfectly astonishing errors of his own. This reviewer, who has the habit of marking up his book with marginal comments upon dubious statements, counts about 150 such comments in his copy of the present volume, which has only about 280 pages of text. Whether errors or only debatable points, they completely spoil a book that otherwise might have had distinct merit.

The University of Chicago. LOUIS GOTTSCHALK.

James Silk Buckingham, 1786–1855: a Social Biography. By Ralph E. Turner, Ph. D., Associate Professor of History, University of Pittsburgh. (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1934, pp. 463, $5.00.) Buckingham is one of the lesser known English reformers of the first half of the nineteenth century. His decidedly variegated life began with sailing ventures from his native Cornwall, included experience as an adviser of Mehemet Ali, travels in the Near East, and an overland journey to India. While in Calcutta, Buckingham was so severe a critic of the Company that his *Calcutta Journal* was suppressed and he was expelled. On his return to England in 1823, Buckingham continued to find much that needed attention; he boldly attacked transportation, colonial misgovernment, impressment, and social conditions in the factory towns. His attempts to bring about marine reform and his leadership of the temperance movement were noteworthy. Buckingham had some affinities, both with the orthodox Radicals and the Tory Evangelicals—going beyond both groups, however, in his faith in popular government and the control of economic activity by a democracy. His liberalism was much more thoroughgoing than that of an Ashley or a Roebuck. He sympathized with the Chartists, but would have limited the franchise to those who could read.

The volume is made attractive by much apt phrasing and an abundance of odd, frank, and refreshing matter on social conditions. The author has skillfully used the little-known but numerous books and articles by Buckingham to illuminate the years covered by his life. The volume is excellently documented and shows abundant knowledge of much out-of-the-way material.

The reviewer, however, questions the need for a biography of this "swashbuckling Puritan", which includes so much of social history not intimately touched in a leading way by Buckingham. He is often but the excuse for a portrayal at length of general social conditions. Press control in India is handled with great minuteness, nor does there seem much point to the inclusion, for example, of the detailed and excellent study of conditions in Manchester. The full account of the rising temperance movement, with which Buckingham was intimately connected as a leader, is valuable. During

the late thirties he toured the United States and Canada, especially as an advocate of teetotalism, but also with an eye to money making by means of lectures. Buckingham saw much of interest in "hurrying" America, from blind pigs and religious quackery to a low commercial morality and the strong strain of "lawlessness" in our heritage.

The author has made unnecessary efforts to add piquancy to the volume by such section-titles as "Before Volstead", and by fanciful efforts to link Buckingham with Gandhi and the moving world of "1932". F. D. Maurice's middle name is misspelled; Plimsoll, not Plimpsoll, was the later advocate of protection for sailors. "Worsely" (p. 373) is probably a slip. The index might have been made a more complete reference to the social data in the volume.

Miami University. HOWARD ROBINSON.

The National Workshops: a Study in the French Revolution of 1848. By Donald Cope McKay, Harvard University. [Harvard Historical Studies, Volume XXXV.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1933, pp. xxvi, 191, $2.50.) This monograph starts with a good sketch of the economic history of France from 1815 to 1848, with special reference to the labor movement, but including the main features of industrial development. It does not go far below the surface, but every historian who has worked in this field knows how hard it is to obtain facts in French industrial history, and how little material of value on the subject is available.

The author has given himself a difficult task. His subject is full of socialistic dynamite. Practically all of the French material is strongly partisan. He shows that he has read carefully the published books, and that he has searched industriously through the archives and the contemporary newspapers and reviews. He threads his way adroitly through a maze of sentiment, propaganda, and conflicting testimony. He is able to study a document with accuracy and clarity. Where the motives of an individual or a committee have been misinterpreted in the more widely known accounts of the subject, or seem obscure for other reasons, he brings them out with a combination of skill and impartiality that inspires confidence. He has a pleasing style and a good sense of proportion, showing no desire to make too much of small incidents or to give several accounts of an important event in order to show that he has read widely about it.

This book, published by the Harvard University Press, is well printed and attractively bound, and has been prepared for the press with care, so that the number of misprints is negligible. The reviewer has found none that deserve to be noted. He has also found no serious errors in either the presentation of facts or their interpretation. It is his conclusion that *The National Workshops* is brief, adequate, and reliable, and that its author has shown himself

to be a historian of remarkably sound judgment. There is an excellent bibliography.

The University of Michigan. ARTHUR L. DUNHAM.

Die Weltwirtschaftskrisis von 1857–1859. Von Hans Rosenberg, vormals Privatdozent der Geschichte an der Universität Köln. [Beiheft 30 zur Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, herausgegeben von Dr. H. Aubin.] (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1934, pp. 210, 9 M.) Two distinctive features characterize Dr. Rosenberg's study of the economic crisis of 1857. First, his scant attention to and almost deliberate avoidance of pure theory. His is the historian's, not the economist's, approach; in a few introductory pages the author rejects the familiar cycle theory as too dogmatic and too deductive. He prefers to examine the crisis of 1857 in its full historical framework, not ignoring political phenomena. The second feature Dr. Rosenberg stresses is the world-wide character and unity of the crisis. He traces its effects as far away as Chile and South Africa. The author has deliberately selected the crisis of 1857 because he regards it as the first in modern times to have such universality. The monograph, for all its brief two hundred pages, covers more than the crisis proper. The first half is actually a detailed analysis of the course of economic expansion throughout the world, which attained boom proportions between 1848 and 1857. Then came the crash and panic. In only one chapter, at the middle, does the panic itself receive attention. The remaining chapters describe the depressing effects of the panic upon economic activity in various parts of the world, with an almost bewildering wealth of statistical illustration. In spite of this, the account is hardly adequate for any one country, except perhaps in the case of the German lands in Central Europe. There is neither index nor page caption to lead the reader to the many topics collected here.

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. SAMUEL REZNECK.

The Suez Canal: its Past, Present, and Future. By Lieutenant Colonel Sir Arnold T. Wilson. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. xv, 224, $6.00.) This is the first brief, comprehensive history of the Suez Canal written by an Englishman in sixty years. Sir Arnold Wilson, a distinguished British soldier, is already widely known as an authority on Near and Middle Eastern affairs, particularly for his scholarly work on Persia and Mesopotamia. The present volume, written primarily from the point of view of British interests, takes up the question of the Suez Canal from its first faint beginnings in Ancient history, carries the story down to the negotiations which led to its final construction under Ferdinand de Lesseps and its opening to maritime traffic in 1869. The author discusses in some detail the original British opposition to the canal project and the diplomacy which led to the acquisition

the khedive's shares in 1875, thanks to the preponderance of British commerce in the region and to the demands of British imperialism in the East and India. Particularly significant are his chapters on the problem of canal dues, the finances of the canal company, and the rivalry with the Panama Canal after the completion of that waterway.

The last two chapters of the book constitute a polemic largely with the Marquis de Vogüé, chairman of the board of the Suez Canal Company, over the high rates which, the author charges, have been imposed on shipping. He believes that unless there is a lowering of the rates, the Suez Canal will suffer as a great waterway. To state it briefly, Sir Arnold urges that a private company should no longer be permitted to monopolize such a vital international route, and he believes the profits of the canal company are out of all proportion in these days of depression. He also believes that the British government, which controls forty-six per cent of the shares, should be allowed more than ten votes at the general assembly of shareholders when questions of policy are decided. In conclusion, the author declares: "Unchanging political or commercial organizations are no more possible than unchanging species. . . . The task before us is to introduce into the control and administration of the Suez Canal the changes necessary to enable it to play in the future the important rôle which it has occupied in the past."

The author includes more than forty pages of appendixes with such important documents as the original act of concession of November 30, 1854, the statutes of the company (1856), the rules of navigation of the Suez Canal (January, 1933), and selections from the correspondence relating to canal dues. Sir Arnold Wilson's volume should become one of the very useful and standard works on an issue which in Viscount Grey's studied phrase "is very complicated and requires to be elucidated".

Miami University. HARRY N. HOWARD.

Mes souvenirs, 1844–1928. Par Gustave Schlumberger, membre de l'Institut. Introduction par Adrien Blanchet. Deux tomes. (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1934, pp. iii, 394; 419, 30 fr. each.) These reminiscences might be more interesting than they are, for the author's experience covered a wide sweep of years. As a boy of fifteen he was in Pau when the Austrian prisoners captured in the Italian war arrived and yet he lived through the postwar period to die in 1929, the year of the death of Georges Clemenceau whom he had known in a Paris hospital as a fellow interne. However, for what is given us let us be thankful. It is a record of constant activity as a young medical student, as an enthusiastic student of and writer on Byzantine history, as a numismatist and sigillographer, a persistent traveler, particularly in the Near East, and a friend or acquaintance of almost everybody of note of his day. Historians, archæologists, authors, actors, painters, statesmen, per-

sonages of *le grand monde,* Schlumberger had met them all and characterizes them favorably or surprisingly unfavorably. It is well worth while to be given a personally edited biographical dictionary of France and Europe for sixty years of the Third Republic.

Though we may wish that the problems of Byzantine studies, and their progress which he did so much to further, had been emphasized more fully, one is grateful for vivid stories like those of his two candidatures for the Academy with the light they throw on French intellectual society.

To the historian the most valuable chapters are those which describe a young surgeon's experiences at Sedan after the battle and with the French army which retreated to Vendôme in 1871. The total lack of preparation on the part of Napoleon III's government, the sufferings of the wounded as a result of shell fire, the obstinate bravery of the *francs-tireurs,* and the bewildered rage of the army at what they called their "betrayal" live again in a moving narrative. Throughout the book the tragedy of the *Affaire Dreyfus* lies like a shadow. Schlumberger was passionately anti-Dreyfus and makes clear how France was torn by hostile convictions and implacable hatred. Yes, there is a re-creation of great emotion in the book, though passages of particular interest are infrequent. One reaches an oasis occasionally; but, except to the Parisian colleague and friend, the desert is rather wide and waterless.

Princeton University. HENRY R. SHIPMAN.

Les causes de la Guerre mondiale: Précis historique. Par Camille Bloch, directeur de la bibliothèque et du musée de la Grande Guerre, professeur à la Sorbonne. (Paris, Paul Hartmann, 1933, pp. 253, 12 fr.) Professor Camille Bloch has not made in this volume any important contribution to research on the causes of the World War nor, to do him justice, has he pretended to do so. His book is a summary of the immediate causes of the war for the "ready reference" of the Frenchman who makes no pretense to be a specialist on the subject. The ideal book of this class will be clear, impersonal, and impartial, a mere windowpane through which facts can be seen. The first two qualifications are well met; the narrative is clear and simple and the forest is never hidden by the trees, as in so many books on this tangled subject. But impartial it is not. Though German authors are quoted more freely than French, and each one of the illustrations or plates in the book is from a German source, the aim in every case is to take advantage of significant admissions by the enemy. Much is said (and rightly, for this is a point ignored or slurred over in many works on prewar diplomacy) of Austro-Hungarian menaces toward Serbia before the war; on the other hand, almost nothing is said of Serbian intrigues against the Dual Monarchy. Serbian, Russian, and French diplomatic policies are placed in the most favorable light, as a single-minded striving for peace, and his general conclusion (p. 217) is: "One finds

no indication that without the concerted initiatives of the governments of Vienna and Berlin . . . this war would have broken out from the action of Serbia, Russia, France or England". He has an interesting chapter on German socialism and the war. He makes out a very strong case for the pacific intentions of Premier Viviani of France, based on his telegrams urging moderation and accommodation up to the very outbreak of the struggle and on the testimony of the Austrian and German ambassadors at Paris (pp. 128–132).

The University of Michigan. PRESTON SLOSSON.

De la Meuse à Reims: Le général Alfred Micheler, 1914–1918, d'après ses notes, sa correspondance, et les souvenirs personnels de l'auteur. Par Colonel E. Herbillon. (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1933, pp. ii, 318, 16 fr. 50.) General Micheler occupied important posts on the western front throughout the war. He was a voluminous correspondent, and his letters to intimate friends (with other papers) form the basis of this sketch of his war-time career. Written by a brother officer who was a close friend throughout that time, it has a peculiarly intimate quality and is not marred by a partisan note. Although not a major contribution, even small points of detail have the value of first-hand and contemporary evidence. Thus, on August 1, 1914, the diary records that even during the railway journey to the frontier, General Sarrail still expected no war: " 'Comment? vous croyez à la guerre?' Devant mon ahurissement, il ajoute: 'Vous verrez que tout va s'arranger.' "

Among others, Micheler wrote constantly to Dubost, the president of the senate. He was not an intriguer and seems to have been loyal to his chiefs; but in letters his custom was to *dévoiler sa pensée* without stint. With an almost journalistic facility he showered on Dubost comments on affairs quite outside his own field, and even full-dress memoranda with programs for the whole conduct of the war. Dubost, in turn, employed these offerings to intervene in matters of military policy; and this private wire produced very unwelcome reverberations. Admittedly a competent officer, Micheler became a thorn in the side of all his superiors. "Je vous supplie de modérer votre passion d'écrire", so the author appealed to his friend in 1917; and Pétain also gave a friendly warning. Foch had less patience, and in June, 1918, relieved Micheler of his command. This personal history the author has treated in such a way as to bring forward strikingly one of the 'temperamental' complications which beset the French command throughout the war.

Cambridge. T. H. THOMAS.

Sanctions and Treaty Enforcement. By Payson S. Wild, jr., Instructor in Government, Harvard University. [Harvard Political Studies.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1934, pp. xiii, 231, $2.50.) The first two chapters of this book contain clear and helpful discussions of the meaning

of treaties and sanctions, the latter term being carefully traced through Roman, medieval, and modern usage. As a result of his analysis, the author suggests (pp. 57–58) an "ideal" or composite definition of sanctions which includes the legal penalties of the Austinian or analytical school, the psychological motives of the ethical school, and the community standards of justice stressed by the sociologists. This definition permits the author in chapter III to cite and discuss seven kinds of sanctions in international law; but he points out that these do not necessarily pertain to treaties, especially to treaties of peace. His fourth chapter, therefore, which comprises one-half of his book, discusses a round dozen of sanctions applicable to treaties; and his short chapter V on "Implementation" adds three more to the list. Half of these he regards as "obsolete or of small importance", while those of current importance he considers to be third party guarantees; mutual agreement for coöperation in enforcement; forfeiture of land, cities, goods, or revenues held as pledges; loss of advantages, political and other, if the treaty be violated or abrogated; and the nullification of gains resulting from acts contrary to the treaty. Each of these sanctions is illustrated by historic incidents of an enlightening and convincing kind. The conclusions of the study are that sanctions are not automatic; that they rely upon a sense of responsibility which is, fortunately, increasing among states; but that, with the multiplication of treaties covering economic questions, collective coercion (as found in Article 16 of the League of Nations) is becoming more obviously "logical".

The last seventeen pages of the book offer a detached and very suggestive discussion of the need or desirability of any sanctions at all; the final conclusion being, apparently, that our best hope lies in making only "just" treaties which public opinion can and will cause to be observed—provided a world public opinion can be aroused and applied by a well-organized world community. Hence Article 19 of the Covenant of the League of Nations is appropriately stressed (pp. 19-36, *et al.*); but one striking omission from the argument is the neglect of the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the half-dozen other means of pacific settlement developed by the Hague conferences.

Swarthmore College. WILLIAM I. HULL.

Documents relating to Currency, Exchange, and Finance in Nova Scotia, with Prefatory Documents, 1675–1758. Selected by Adam Shortt, completed with an Introduction by V. K. Johnston, and revised and edited by Gustave Lanctot. [Board of Historical Publications.] (Ottawa, J. O. Patenaude, 1933, pp. xlix, 495.) Dr. Adam Shortt, who *was* the Board of Historical Publications, died in 1930 and the board was abolished the next year after Dr. Johnston's retirement. Since then governmental retrenchment makes it seem likely that this volume will be the last for some time of the notable series planned by Dr. Shortt and sponsored by Dr. Doughty. It is an

abridgment by Dr. Lanctot of a larger collection assembled for the same period, which in turn was one of several collections of the most varied source materials which may be consulted in typescript at Ottawa. One other collection relating to Canadian currency, etc., during the French régime was published in two volumes in 1925. Dr. Doughty expresses the hope, which will be echoed by students of Canadian history, that in more prosperous times publication may be resumed.

The period comprised was that during which Nova Scotia was most truly New England's outpost. Indeed Dr. Johnston errs (p. xv) in asserting that the Acadians before 1710 had no external trade. Two of the eight notable buildings at Port Royal in 1685 were New England warehouses. During the four lively periods of the history treated here, *i.e.*, the wars of the League of Augsburg and of Spanish and Austrian Successions and the early years of Halifax, New England was the dominant influence. Her fluctuating paper currency, competing with French silver from Louisbourg and a salad of coinage from Philadelphia, New York, and London, demonstrated Gresham's Law and drove Nova Scotian and other bookkeepers to distraction. Both in the purely technical financial aspects and in the general economic picture from which they emerge, Dr. Johnston is quite successful in establishing the regional economic system from Boston to Louisbourg. He might fittingly have completed his arc to Newfoundland and the Grand Banks.

Five hundred large pages of introduction and documents give far more than the materials for knowledge of currency, exchange, and finance and do so on a scale and in a character not justifiable in ordinary historical monographs. Not only students of economic, but of political and social history will find much rewarding material in the documents. Dr. Johnston's introduction is necessarily a very compressed guide to the materials and is generally sound. He is wrong in saying (p. xv) that from 1700 to 1750 the Annapolis valley was the only settled part of Nova Scotia, and if he had known how the Halifax and London merchants mulcted the settlers through the bounty certificates, his many references to the whole bounty system would have been more pointed and assured.

Columbia University. J. B. Brebner.

Come gli Americani scoprirono l'Italia, 1750–1850. Per Giuseppe Prezzolini. (Milan, Fratelli Treves, 1933, pp. xi, 305.) For some years professor of Italian culture at Columbia University, the distinguished author of this little book has chosen to study the American mind by observing the reactions of Americans in Italy to the culture of his own country. In the century from 1750 to 1850 the Americans gradually, to use his phrase, "discovered Italy". Professor Prezzolini is interested in this process as a historical fact, but he is more interested in his witnesses' unconscious disclosure of themselves.

A tolerant, urbane, and penetrating observer, he has reached some conclusions about Americans and American civilization which his attentive study of their impressions of Italy a century ago abundantly confirms and illustrates. After a chapter on travelers in Washington's time, who furnish keys to certain marked traits and types, the book becomes a series of essays on such topics as "The Protestant Illusion", "The Puritan Prejudice", "Catholic Travellers", "Woman and the Italian Family", "The Italian Character and the 'Italianizing' Americans of the Time". In these the author skillfully turns his material to reveal its many facets, but the American characteristics that he finds most striking are the tendency to moralize, and our failure to appreciate the meaning of leisure or of life as an art, except as expressed in immediately useful action. At the same time he finds in us a certain freshness of observation and a welcome absence of English and Continental prejudices, which yield him some telling comments on Italian personalities and manners.

Travel literature is tricky material, and Professor Prezzolini handles his with admirable deftness and appreciation of its limitations and its possibilities. He observes our traits through the wise and friendly eyes of a representative of an older civilization, on whose rights he gently but firmly insists. His Italian public will be interested in the book as a sketch of our national character. Those who wish to study the earlier development of cultural relations between Italy and the United States will find in it a pioneer guide. Its value as such is greatly increased by a bibliography, with critical notes, of more than three hundred printed letters, diaries, biographies, articles, and travel books that Professor Prezzolini has consulted.

The Johns Hopkins University. KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

Charleston Business on the Eve of the American Revolution. By Leila Sellers, Ph.D. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1934, pp. xi, 259, $2.50.) In the realm of American economic history few volumes have appeared in recent years so readable as is this of Miss Sellers. The author has successfully subordinated her detail without over-simplification or loose generalization, thus avoiding the greatest dangers which beset the historian of economic life. Fortunately her range is wider than that suggested by her title: the geography of Charleston, its population and institutions throughout the century, its relations with the hinterland as well as with overseas countries, its currency and its foreign exchange, the methods of immigration, Negroes as artisans and in trade, all come in for treatment. Consideration of the work of the factor and the credit system by which business was carried on, an examination of economic classes (which the author concludes were not the result of slavery but were brought from the Old World), and a survey of the chief export crops, prepare the way for the consideration of business conditions in the years immediately pre-

ceding the Revolution. Special attention is given to the trade in slaves, rice, indigo, and hides, and chapters on illicit trade and on non-importation give opportunity for welding the political and economic conditions into a whole. For the most part Miss Sellers's conclusions are amply documented. Occasionally, however, one wishes that she had presented her evidence. For instance, one would be glad to know the material from which she drew her conclusion concerning the amount of slave trade in the seventeenth century (p. 53).

Minor questions may be raised, but none that ought to diminish the reader's appreciation of Miss Sellers's work. Is not the fact that Carolina's exports exceeded her imports from Great Britain of slight importance so long as slaves are not included among her imports (p. 57)? The author's reason for the rapid increase of the Liverpool slave trade is of doubtful validity (p. 125). And certainly the inference that few American vessels carried slaves cannot be drawn from the table on page 126. The statement that the Royal African Company (founded in 1672 not 1662) was divested of the charter which entitled it to monopoly in 1752 is misleading. The company had not had a complete monopoly since 1698. The reviewer is doubtful as to the meaning of the sentence "Since £700 currency was equal to £100 sterling selling goods at 7 for 1 was selling at prime cost" (p. 50). Occasionally one is annoyed to find an irrelevant paragraph which has crept in from the author's notebook. These, however, are slight blemishes in a work which gives to the student reason for gratitude both for its accumulation of material and for its correction of earlier errors.

Wellesley College. ELIZABETH DONNAN.

Philip Vickers Fithian: Journal, 1775–1776, written on the Virginia-Pennsylvania Frontier and in the Army around New York. Edited by Robert Greenhalgh Albion, Associate Professor of History, Princeton University, and Leonidas Dodson, Instructor in History, University of Pennsylvania. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1934, pp. xviii, 279, $3.50.) The author of this *Journal* was a kind of Presbyterian circuit rider who made a missionary tour through the back country of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania at the outbreak of the Revolution, and later served briefly as a chaplain in the Continental Army. He was a keen observer with a quick eye for the humorous and some talent for crisp characterization of persons and places. In the pages of the *Journal* we are admitted to an intimate view of daily life in many frontier or semi-frontier communities in 1775–1776. Such topics as food, dress, manners, morals, amusements, modes of speech, household furnishings and the like are treated sometimes briefly and sometimes with graphic detail. The discomforts of travel in a region recently reclaimed from savagery are feelingly depicted, for Fithian had an old-maidish abhorrence of dirt, fleas, and slatternly house-

keeping. As a preacher he was deeply interested in religious conditions and has much to say regarding the churches, clergy, and congregations in the settlements which he visited. He lends support to the theory that lynch law is a product of the frontier by vividly describing the hanging of a highway robber without the formality of a legal trial by indignant residents of the upper part of Augusta County, Virginia. Of especial importance is his account of the reactions of the frontier to the outbreak of the Revolution. In some places the event created scarcely a ripple of interest. In others it set fire to the fighting spirit of the pioneer. Military companies were organized and drilling became the order of the day. Woe to the slacker who refused to fall into step with the bellicose temper of the community. Tarring and feathering were likely to be his lot, for in the interior, no less than on the seaboard, public opinion was often intolerant of dissent. It is noteworthy as illustrating the unremitting push of the Westward Movement that during the eventful year of 1775, while the hills and highways of eastern Massachusetts echoed to the rattle of musketry, those of western Pennsylvania and Virginia echoed to the rattle of wagons bearing numerous settlers toward the wilderness.

Fithian's service as a regimental chaplain extended from July 13 to his death from dysentery on October 8, 1776. He was an eyewitness of many of the events connected with the campaign in New York. The *Journal* throws light upon the health and morale of Washington's forces and gives some sharply etched descriptions of the Continental soldier in his unheroic moments. Uniquely valuable is the information supplied regarding the duties of chaplains in the patriot army.

The interest and usefulness of the volume are enhanced by an illuminating introduction, two maps, copious and scholarly footnotes, and a well-selected index.

Wellesley College. E. E. Curtis.

The Diary of John Jay during the Peace Negotiations of 1782: being a Complete and Faithful Rendering of the Original Manuscript, now published for the First Time. With an Introduction by Frank Monaghan, Fellow of Calhoun College in Yale University. (New Haven, Yale University Bibliographical Press, 1934, pp. 17, $2.00.) This is a fragment of a diary of John Jay, all that he kept, unfortunately, during the peace negotiations of 1782. About one half of it had previously been published by William Jay, in his *Life* of his father, and by H. P. Johnston in his edition of the *Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay*. Johnston apparently copied from W. Jay, who was not too careful in punctuation, spelling, and little details. The present publication prints the fragment in full. Comparison with W. Jay and Johnston shows one entry in them (June 25, "Wrote to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs") which is not in the original

as here scrupulously reproduced! The newly printed material has matter of importance for the close student of the peace negotiations, particularly the relations of Benjamin Vaughan and Jay, and the effect on Oswald of Strachey's arrival to stiffen the British commissioner at the end of October. The printing is an artistic reproduction of eighteenth century typography most desirable for the bibliophile.

Washington, D. C. SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

Five Fur Traders of the Northwest: being the Narrative of Peter Pond and the Diaries of John Macdonell, Archibald N. McLeod, Hugh Faries, and Thomas Connor. Edited by Charles M. Gates with an Introduction by Grace Lee Nute. [The Minnesota Society of the Colonial Dames of America.] (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1933, pp. v, 298, $3.50.) The fragment of an autobiography and the four diaries here published contain valuable material on the details of the fur trade and the daily life in the trading posts of the North West Company. Peter Pond, familiar to students of the subject through Professor Harold A. Innis's recent biography, was an independent trader of Connecticut birth. His *Narrative,* of which only a small portion has been preserved, was written in his old age, long after the events recorded. The extant portion has been published at least twice before. Mr. Charles M. Gates, who edits it for the present volume, implies, without making the facts entirely clear, that this republication is from an earlier printing in the *Connecticut Magazine,* rather than from the manuscript. He does not explain why the manuscript was not used. The *Narrative* includes some account of Pond's experiences as a soldier in the French and Indian War and as a fur trader in the decade beginning about 1765, at Detroit, Mackinac, and on the upper Mississippi.

The four brief diaries are all published, apparently for the first time, from manuscripts in the possession of McGill University and the Public Archives of Canada. Three of the diarists were employees of the North West Company; the fourth, McLeod, was a *bourgeois,* or partner of the company. The diary ascribed to Hugh Faries may possibly have been written by another trader, Thomas McMurray. The experiences recorded fall between 1793 and 1805, inclusive. Macdonell's diary gives a valuable, detailed description of a journey in 1793 from Montreal via the Ottawa River route to Lake Huron and thence to the upper waters of the Assiniboine River. The others describe the daily life for brief periods at Fort Alexandria on the same river, at the Rainy Lake post, and in the region of Cross Lake and the Snake River in eastern Minnesota.

There is a good index. Three maps are of considerable assistance to the uninitiated reader. Brief biographical sketches by Charles M. Gates and Grace Lee Nute precede the respective diaries and narrative. These are generally satisfactory. A slip in the sketch of Macdonell places his mar-

riage three years after his death (p. 65). The explanatory footnotes are abundant and valuable.

The University of Buffalo. JULIUS W. PRATT.

Grant and Lee: a Study in Personality and Generalship. By Major-General J. F. C. Fuller. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933, pp. 323, $2.75.) The British have for years shown a keen interest in the military aspects of our Civil War. Colonel Henderson's *Stonewall Jackson* has been fed to the embryo officers at Sandhurst year after year. General Maurice more recently tried to replace Jackson by Lee on the highest pedestal. General Fuller would set Grant far above either of the hitherto exalted Southerners. American writers, in the meantime, have also been active in this revaluation of Civil War reputations, Grant and Sherman both profiting by their work.

This book falls into three parts. The first forty pages analyze "The Two Causes", the principal argument of interest being that commanders on both sides generally failed to appreciate the tactical consequences of the introduction of the rifle. The last 150 pages contain a play-by-play account of the major operations of the war. The unique feature of the book lies in the intervening eighty pages, devoted to the personalities of Grant and Lee.

One may question Fuller's contention that the personality of commanders has been neglected in military history. He declares that "at base, seven-eighths of the history of war is psychological". One could cite scores of cases where material considerations were more important. He states that careful study of the Civil War led him to reverse the conventional schoolbook estimates of Grant and Lee. Grant emerges much more than the stupid butcher, while Lee, instead of being "one of the greatest generals the world has ever seen", seems "one of the most incapable Generals-in-Chief in history". The reader will probably remain unconvinced by Fuller's extreme conclusions. Both men are left with middling stature. Lee, it is claimed, was capable of brilliant tactical victories lacking decisive strategical results, while Grant loathed the tactical side of war with its slaughter but the strategical side fascinated him. Enough is shown of the strong elements of Grant's character and ability to lift him out of the "stupid butcher" category yet he remains considerably below Marlborough, Frederick the Great, and other first-raters. Lee is criticized for his failure to remove incompetent subordinates, his poor supply service, and his failure to correct these faults by pressure on the Confederate government. It may be said in his defense that those weaknesses were inherent in the Confederacy itself, for the state rights idea carried to its logical conclusion prevented effective concentration of power, and by the time Lee was in a position to exert his influence upon the government, the harm had been done.

The book is well written and well documented. The detailed source references give evidence of wide and deep study of the sources, official and unofficial.

Princeton University. ROBERT G. ALBION.

Unionism and Reconstruction in Tennessee, 1860–1869. By James Welch Patton, Ph.D., Professor of History, Converse College. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1934, pp. xii, 267, $3.50.) This is the volume that has long been needed to complete an excellent series on the Reconstruction period in the Southern states, for which excellent scholarly patterns were set many years ago by Professor Dunning and some of the scholars he trained and inspired.

The author states that the purpose of his study is "to trace the history of the commonwealth of Tennessee through that turbulent, bewildered, and unhappy period from 1860 to 1869—to show the forces and factors that kept the state from seceding until the pressure of events proved that neutrality would be impossible; the factors and events that contributed to its early restoration to the Union, the policy of the reconstruction governor and the changes in it that occurred in response to the demands of the Radical party at Washington; and to estimate the ultimate effect of this policy upon the state. To these topics are of necessity added the chapters dealing with the Freedmen's Bureau and the Ku Klux Klan, bridging a gap in the story that would otherwise be caused by the omission of an account of the activity of these picturesque and important institutions."

In most of the states previously studied the political pattern (the part of the story dealt with almost exclusively in the present volume) is almost stereotyped in that it centers around the efforts of local leaders to combat the Radical congressional policies and program in order to reëstablish local control. In Tennessee, however, the plot is quite different because it centers around an internecine contest between factions, largely on geographical lines, within the state for control. Though the author commends Governor William G. Brownlow for the consistent pursuit of his policy to reëstablish the state in its normal position in the Union, allying himself with the congressional Radicals and thus sparing the state many of the particular horrors that accompanied the Radical congressional program in most of the other Southern states, the reviewer wonders whether Brownlow did not merely substitute one type of bitterness and horror for another.

Though the author says that in "large measure the explanation of this singular record is to be found in the political and intellectual background of the state and the character of its economic and industrial resources, factors which alike made secession undesirable and the speedy readmission of the state an event to be eagerly anticipated", economic and social history receive but slight consideration in comparison with the excellent treatment

of political phases of the story. The treatment of Brownlow the leader and of the Brownlow régime is the best that it has been the reviewer's privilege to read.

The University of Chicago. C. S. Boucher.

Old Waybills: the Romance of the Express Companies. By Alvin F. Harlow. (New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934, pp. xii, 503, $5.00.) Following *Old Towpaths* and *Old Post Bags,* this book comes as the third in Mr. Harlow's series portraying the romance of American transportation. From a vast field of source material he has gathered an array of interesting facts and incidents. Stressing the romantic and spectacular he presents a story filled with glamour. He has found a number of predecessors of W. F. Harnden (usually credited with the founding of the express business), some of whom date back to colonial days. The remarkable growth of express service in the United States during the middle nineteenth century is well portrayed. The part it played in the development of the Far West, especially in serving remote mining camps, is appropriately stressed. Perhaps an undue proportion of the book—135 pages—is devoted to highwaymen and robbers. The James boys, the Youngers, Sam Bass, Black Bart, the Dalton brothers, Sontag, and others come in for rather extensive treatments, even though the stories of their careers are sometimes but remotely connected with the express business.

Some minor errors were noted (pp. 216, 243, 245, 258, 317), but considering the wide field covered, the book appears to be remarkably free from serious ones. The story is well written and makes fascinating reading. Not only does it provide entertainment, but it presents much valuable information, the fruit of extensive research. The volume is really "profusely illustrated", containing numerous reproductions of express franks, express company buildings, portraits, and old photographs and drawings. There is a helpful bibliography, but the index is inadequate.

The State Museum, Denver. LeRoy R. Hafen.

La Francia y la monarquía in el Plata, 1818–1820. Por Mario Belgrano. (Buenos Aires, A. García Santos, 1933, pp. 230.) By the use of materials hitherto not examined in the archives of Madrid, Seville, and Paris, the author has thrown new light upon a subject often discussed by the historians of Latin American diplomacy. He has made a definitive study of an interesting, although rather unimportant, episode in the foreign relations of Argentina.

After winning their independence, the Thirteen Colonies of English America moved steadily toward a democracy. The liberated colonies of Spain, on the contrary, doubted, wavered, and shifted back and forth before making the final decision in favor of popular government. Señor Belgrano

deals with the relationship of France and the agents of the monarchists of the Río de la Plata during a brief two years. Various princes were proposed for a throne in this region—among them the Italian Duke of Luca, whose mother was a Bourbon. The French government supported the monarchical project, but the Spanish Bourbons were uncompromising, Russia revealed no enthusiasm, and Argentine opinion was divided. Moreover, the British Foreign Office, while not opposed to the establishment of monarchies in America, was quite suspicious of France's possible designs with reference to Spain's American colonies. The plan, therefore, had little chance of success.

Duke University. J. Fred Rippy.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Part IV of the Report of the Commission on the Social Studies has as its subject *Tests and Measurements in the Social Sciences* (Scribner's, 1934, pp. xiv, 633, $3.00). The editors are Dr. Truman L. Kelley, of the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, and Professor A. C. Krey, of the University of Minnesota, who was also chairman of the Commission. Among the contributors of special sections are Luella Cole Pressey, of the Ohio State University, who presents "A Study in the Learning of the Fundamental Special Vocabulary of History from the Fourth to the Twelfth Grades"; Edith Putnam Parker, of the University of Chicago, who gives a "Report on the Work of the Committee on Geography Tests"; Marion Clark, director of the Upper Elementary and Junior High Schools in Montclair, who deals with "The Construction of Exercises in the Use of Historical Evidence"; and A. M. Jordan, of the University of North Carolina, who discusses "Cheating in the Classroom". There are studies of systems of tests by the projectors—the "Wesley Test in Social Terms" and the "Kelty-Moore Test of Concepts in the Social Studies". Important phases of the subject are also treated by Dr. Kelley. Professor Krey has had the happy idea of describing in a substantial introduction the processes through which, over a period of four or five years, the committee has finally reached its conclusions. These he has stated in section VI. A bibliography of thirty-six pages shows how intensely the problem of tests has agitated the educational mind. Part IX of the Report of the Commission has also appeared: *The Social Foundations of Education,* by Professor George S. Counts.

The Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund committee announces the publication of two volumes edited by Gilbert H. Barnes and Dwight L. Dumond, entitled *The Letters of Theodore D. Weld, Angelina Grimké Weld, and Sarah Grimké.* This correspondence sheds important light upon the anti-slavery movement, especially as it developed in the Middle West. The correspondence is so extensive and so intimate that it not only gives details in regard to historical events, but also a very revealing series of pictures of the mentality and the psychology of those enthusiasts who did so much to stimulate the anti-slavery agitation. There are very few sources now available which present such valuable material in regard to the peculiar complexes and psychological vagaries of the reformer type.

The committee for the Littleton-Griswold Fund reports that the volume of *Selections from the Records of the Mayor's Court of New York City,*

edited by Dr. Richard B. Morris, is going through the press and will be ready for distribution during the winter. This will be followed at no long interval by the *Records of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Rhode Island,* upon which Mrs. Dorothy S. Towle and Professor Charles M. Andrews are working.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIST OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

[Research work undertaken to satisfy the requirements of advanced degrees not included]

IV. Modern Europe

A history of British propaganda during the Great War. Prog. One year. Duane Squires, *Colby Junior College.*

IX. Great Britain and Ireland

(b) Since 1485

John Henry, British agent. Prog. 300 pages. E. W. Flaccus, Tucson.

XVIII. United States of America

(7) Before 1782

Contemporary histories of the British colonies in North America. Prog. One year. Jarvis M. Morse, *Brown.*

The British treasury in the administration of the American colonies. Prog. Several years. Dora Mae Clark, *Wilson.*

(8) Since 1782

Aviation activities in the Union Army. Prog. One year. Duane Squires, *Colby Junior.*

(10) Middle Atlantic Colonies and States

The life of Chancellor Robert R. Livingston. Prog. Several years. Courtney Robert Hall, *Adelphi.*

Biography of Johnson N. Camden, a capitalist and Democratic politician of West Virginia. Prog. One year. Festus P. Summers, *West Virginia.*

(11) Southern Colonies and States

Transylvania: the fight for a fourteenth American colony. Prog. 1000 pages. Archibald Henderson, *North Carolina.*

The Transylvania Company: a documentary history. Prog. 500 pages. Archibald Henderson, *North Carolina.*

Joel Roberts Poinsett. Prog. Four years. Charles Lyon Chandler, Philadelphia, and Edwin J. Pratt, *Harvard.*

The Medical Department of the Confederate Navy. Prog. Two years. Courtney Robert Hall, *Adelphi.*

PERSONAL

John William Black, professor emeritus of history at Union College, died on September 3 at the age of 68. After gaining his doctorate at the Johns

Hopkins University in 1891, he served for many years as professor of history at Colby College. Prior to his retirement in 1932 he had been for eight years professor at Union College.

Berthold Laufer, anthropologist and Orientalist, died on September 13 at the age of 60. He was curator of anthropology in the Field Museum. A prolific writer, he was especially interested in the development of Chinese art.

Henry Plauché Dart, editor of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, and archivist of the Louisiana Historical Society, died on September 27 at the age of 76. Mr. Dart was a lawyer by profession, but he was equally interested in the records and history of his state. One of his principal achievements was the protection from deterioration of the Records of the French Superior Court of Louisiana (1717–1769) and the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana (1769–1803). He wrote histories of the superior court of the territory (1804–1812), and of the supreme court of the state (1813–1912).

William Lawrence Clements, who presented to the University of Michigan a great collection of Americana and an appropriate building to house it, died on November 7 at the age of 74.

Rayner Wickersham Kelsey, professor of history at Haverford College, died on October 29 at the age of 55. A member of the class of 1900 at Earlham College he took his doctorate at the University of California in 1909. In that year he became an instructor at Haverford, being promoted to a professorship in 1920. One of his principal writings was *Friends and the Indians, 1655–1917* (1917).

Charles Edward Terry Lull, colonel in the United States Army, died on November 12 at the age of 54. After studying at Lehigh and Columbia universities he entered the army in 1902. From 1931 to 1933 he was chief of the historical section in the Army War College. He was also the principal organizer of the American Military Historical Foundation, being secretary and treasurer at the time of his death.

Stephen d'Irsay, formerly associate professor of the history of medicine at the Johns Hopkins University, died in Paris on December 1. He was born in Hungary in 1894 and took his doctorate in medicine at the University of Budapest in 1917. Four years later he came to the United States, where he served in various hospitals and medical schools. After further studies at the École des chartes in Paris, and the Institute of the History of Medicine in Leipzig, he joined the staff of the Johns Hopkins University. At the time of his death he was at work on a *Histoire des universités françaises et étrangères des origines à nos jours*, the first volume of which was published in 1933 (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIX, 301).

Arthur Herbert Noyes, associate professor of history in the Ohio State

University, died on December 3 at the age of 47. He was a graduate of the University of Wisconsin in the class of 1912 and gained his doctorate at the University of Michigan in 1925. He also studied at Harvard, Oxford, and London universities. He began his teaching at Ohio State University in 1920, became assistant professor in 1926, and associate professor in 1932. His principal publication was *A History of the Military Obligation in Late Medieval England, based on a Study of the Commissions of Array* (1930, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVII, 151).

Three German historians of distinction have died recently: Alfred Doren, of the University of Leipzig (July 28, aged 65), whose work lay chiefly in the field of Florentine economic history; Johannes Kromayer, also of Leipzig, emeritus (September 22, aged 75), notable for his studies of ancient military history; and Carl Neumann, of the University of Heidelberg (October 9, aged 64), whose field was the history of art.

Professor Allan Nevins, of Columbia University, has recently delivered six lectures on The World Crisis, 1929–1934, at the University of London under the auspices of the Sir George Watson Chair of American History, Literature, and Institutions.

Professor Walter Prichard, of the department of history, Louisiana State University, has been chosen editor of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, replacing the late Henry P. Dart.

Professor Duncan McArthur, formerly Douglas Professor of Canadian and Colonial History at Queen's University, Kingston, has been appointed deputy minister of education for the province of Ontario. He is succeeded in the Douglas chair by Professor Reginald George Trotter.

Professor A. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, well known as one of the editors of the *Grosse Politik*, recently professor of international law and director of the Institut für auswärtige Politik at the University of Hamburg, has been elected research fellow at the University of Oxford.

Further announcements are: *George Washington University*, Lowell J. Ragatz to be executive officer of the department; *Louisiana State University*, Charles E. Smith, of the University of Louisville, to be assistant professor; *University of California at Los Angeles*, William F. Adams to be associate professor.

GENERAL

General review: Marc Bloch, *Champs et villages* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Sept.); W. P. M. Kennedy, *Annual Survey of the Literature of Constitutional and Administrative Law* (Can. Hist. Rev., Sept.); Paul Marie Masson, *Histoire de la musique* (Rev. Hist., May).

The Association of Research Libraries, with Donald B. Gilchrist, its

executive secretary, as editor, has compiled a list of the *Doctoral Dissertations accepted by American Universities, 1933–1934* (H. W. Wilson Company, pp. xvi, 88, $1.00),[1] which is intended to be annual. The American Council of Learned Societies and the National Research Council are sponsoring the project, and it is hoped that the publication may become self-supporting. The list includes 2630 dissertations of which only 966 are certainly to be printed.

Columbia University is to conduct, during the summer of 1935, a seminar in Far Eastern studies similar to those held at Harvard University in 1932 and at the University of California in 1934.

In *Agricultural History* for October appears "A Bibliography of the Writings of Ulrich Bonnell Phillips", prepared by Professor Fred Landon and Mr. Everett E. Edwards. The same number includes Professor Louis B. Schmidt's address as president of the Agricultural History Society, entitled "The Agricultural Revolution in the Prairies and the Great Plains of the United States".

As a fitting memorial of its centenary the Royal Statistical Society has issued a volume entitled *Annals of the Royal Statistical Society, 1834–1934*. The society was originally a section of the British Association. The portraits of many notable statisticians are included.

Volume III of *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Herefordshire* (London, H. M. Stationery Office, pp. lxvii, 264, 4 maps, 124 plans, 188 plates, 30*s*.), by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, completes the survey of the county by describing the northwestern section. Vol. I (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI, 196) dealt with the southwest, and vol. II (*ibid.*, XXXVIII, 403), with the eastern section. One feature of this volume is the large number of earthworks, several of the motte and bailey type, which are recommended as "especially worthy of preservation". The most notable earthwork in the county is Offa's Dyke, which since the researches of Dr. Cyril Fox and Mr. D. W. Phillips is regarded as "a delimitation of the frontier between Wales and Mercia". It never was a continuous work, as formerly supposed, deep woods in sections obviating the necessity of special defenses. The longest gap is about six miles. Among the secular monuments recommended for preservation the little town of Weobley, near Leominster, has eight, timber-framed houses ranging from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. They are exhibited to great advantage in plates 176–180. Among the noteworthy churches is that of Pembridge, which has a timbered belfrey dating from the fourteenth century. The care and skill with which everything is described and the taste and judgment shown in the method of illustrating the material excite admiration.

[1] Books mentioned in this and the following sections were published in 1934 unless another date is given.

The British Academy has published, in pamphlet form (Humphrey Milford), biographical papers on Percy S. Allen the editor of the letters of Erasmus, A. E. Cowley the Orientalist, Paget Toynbee the student of Dante, and J. G. Robertson; also an interesting lecture on the Music of the Renaissance in Italy, by Edward J. Dent, and a learned monograph on Treasure-Trove: the Law and Practice of Antiquity, chiefly under the Roman Empire, by George Hill.

The Right Honourable Josiah C. Wedgwood contributes to the *Political Quarterly* (October) an article, "A History of Parliament and of Public Opinion", which is a review of phases of the constitution of Parliament with stimulating suggestions concerning the relations of members, their constituents, and the government. The author presided, 1928–1930, over a committee to consider the feasibility of producing a history of Parliament from the earliest times which should identify the members and determine their politics. In the past several years another committee under Lord Salisbury composed of members of both houses has devised methods, raised some funds, and made a beginning with the work. W. T. L.

The *Revue bénédictine,* published at the Abbaye de Maredsous, celebrated its fiftieth anniversary with the April-July issue. Several distinguished scholars, aside from its own immediate contributors, have recognized the occasion by submitting articles, Professor F. C. Burkitt of Cambridge, Professor A. Fliche of Montpellier, Professor W. Levison of Bonn, Mgr. G. Mercati of the Vatican Library, and Henri Pirenne, formerly rector of the University of Ghent. Professor Pirenne's paper is entitled 'De l'état de l'instruction des laïques à l'époque mérovingienne".

Social Reformers: Adam Smith to John Dewey, edited by Donald O. Wagner, Ph.D., instructor in history, New York University, with a foreword by Carlton J. H. Hayes (Macmillan, pp. xvii, 749, $3.25), is a well-edited compendium. Dr. Wagner has presented the essence of the social philosophies of some thirty reformers and critics of the *status quo* during the last century and a half. The major categories of modern social thought, economic and political liberalism, utopian and scientific socialism, anarchism, syndicalism, and communism, Christian socialism and Catholic social reform, as well as fascism, are represented. In addition, there are selections from a variety of critics and interpreters of modern society, such as Cobbett, Carlyle, Tolstoy, Veblen, and Dewey. The selections succeed in most instances in giving a fair idea of the range of the author's thought, as well as the quality of his style. Brief informational introductions preface each selection, and the accompanying bibliographies are also helpful. The book should prove useful to teachers who wish their students to have at least a slight first-hand acquaintance with the classics of modern social thought, a knowledge of

which, in the words of Carlton Hayes, is indispensable for an understanding of "the latest stage in the emerging social order". M. E. C.

The extent to which Roman law is studied in Japan forms the subject of a brief brochure by Toshio Muto, professor in the imperial university of Kyushu, entitled *La recezione e gli studi di diritto romano in Giappone* (Modena, Soc. Tip. Modenese, pp. 33).

The Chinese Periodical Press, 1800–1912, by Roswell S. Britton (Shanghai, Kelly and Walsh, 1933, pp. vii, 151, $3.00), based upon native and alien sources, is of considerably more value than the length of a review-note might appear to imply. Following a preliminary survey of indigenous newspapers and gazettes, the introduction of Western journalism into China, through missionary and port channels, is discussed. Its development to the fall of the Manchu empire is traced in conjunction with its influence upon the native press and the growth and significance of the latter practically to the present day. Of especial interest are the chapters dealing with Wang T'ao, Legge's distinguished collaborator, and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, the scholar-journalist exponent of reform. Aside from its worth to students of journalism, Mr. Britton's study is valuable as constituting a chapter of significance in modern Chinese history which includes sidelights upon several outstanding native and foreign characters. A comprehensive, though not exhaustive bibliography, a periodical index, an index of persons, and twenty-four plates illustrating types of Chinese journals are included. H. F. MacN.

Dr. James Harvey Robinson's *An Introduction to the History of Western Europe* (Ginn, 2 vols., pp. x, 545, xxvii; viii, 623, xxxi, $3.00; $3.20), which has given interest and suggestion to a generation of students and readers of history, has received a new edition. To each volume has been added a final chapter, the first entitled "Retrospect and Forecast", summarizing the progress of mankind up till the close of the seventeenth century and looking ahead to the two centuries to follow, the second, entitled "International Problems". In chapters XXXVII, "Europe since the World War", and XL, "Plans for bettering Human Relations", have been embodied considerable new material.

The Basics of the Chinese Civilization (Shanghai, Kelly and Walsh, pp. xi, 112), by Dr. Esson M. Gale, chairman of the department of Oriental languages in the University of California, is a revision of the author's syllabus originally published by the University of California Press. It is a topical outline, divided into sections, each section being provided with lists of additional readings, chiefly selected from works in English. Part I deals with Aspects of China's Cultural Development, Part II, with China's Modern International Relations.

Romantic Copper: its Lure and Lore (D. Appleton-Century, pp. ix, 294, $3.00), by Ira B. Joralemon, presents in a lively narrative the essential facts of

one of the major industries of the present age's electrical development. The author is a practical engineer who has been engaged in prospecting and mining, the world over, for many years. As a minor but necessary service to his readers he has added a glossary of terms in the industry.

The Harvard University Press has added to Professor Wilbur C. Abbott's *A Bibliography of Oliver Cromwell,* published in 1929, an "Index to Periodicals, Publications of Societies, Series, etc.", with a list of "Addenda, Corrigenda, and Delenda", which will be sent free to owners of the volume on application to the Press. The pamphlet is paged continuously with the book.

By a decree-law of July 20, 1934, the government of Italy has taken some immediate measures, and provided for others in future, for the reorganization of historical studies in Italy. The Istituto storico italiano will henceforth have the title Regio Istituto storico italiano per il medievo, and its task will be to provide for the publication of the sources of Italian history for the period 500–1500 A. D. A new body, the Regio Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, will have the corresponding task for the period "from 1500 to the War and the Victory". The Scuola di storia moderna e contemporanea, created at Rome in 1925, is made dependent on this Institute. The Comitato nazionale per la storia del Risorgimento is suppressed, and the task of forming and supervising museums of the Risorgimento is entrusted to the Società nazionale per la storia del Risorgimento italiano. The Società nazionale will have its headquarters in the new Museo centrale del Risorgimento, which is being built on the Capitoline Hill at the side of the Victor Emmanuel monument, in the Via San Pietro in Carcere. The same law created a Giunta centrale per gli studi storici, which has the task of coördinating the activities of the R. Deputazioni di storia patria. On its recommendation the minister of education is to provide, before the end of 1935, for the organization of all the historical institutions of the kingdom, eventually creating and suppressing R. Deputazioni di storia patria.

His Excellency de Vecchi di Val Cismon has been appointed commissioner of the archives of Italy, and may be expected to issue new regulations for their organization and use. Plans were discussed in the annual meeting of the Società nazionale per la storia del Risorgimento, October 10–13, at Cagliari, Sardinia. Two of the papers read: Pietro Fedele, "Sugli archivi privati", and Antonio Monti, "Archivi e musei del Risorgimento", will be found in the September *Rassegna storica del Risorgimento italiano.*

The house in which Mazzini was born in the Via Lomellina, Genoa, has been converted into a national monument, and the seat of an Istituto Mazziniano. It was opened on June 22. It contains a library, archives, and a collection of documents and illustrative material pertaining to the life and thought of Mazzini. K. R. G.

Few historians have so incarnated the spirit of their time and exerted so

potent an influence on it as the great German who with Haym and Delbrück founded the *Preussische Jahrbücher*. To commemorate the centenary of his birth that journal devotes its entire September issue, comprising four important articles: *Heinrich von Treitschke, eine Erinnerung,* by Erich Marcks; *Briefe Treitschkes an Historiker und Politiker vom Oberrhein,* edited by Willy Andreas; *Treitschke, Bismarck, und die "Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert",* by Hans Goldschmidt, and *Die politischen Korrespondenzen Treitschkes in den Preussischen Jahrbüchern,* by Emil Daniels, the last two containing copious extracts from the correspondence and articles of Treitschke.

E. N. C.

Eleven volumes of H. Ehrencron-Müller's biographical encyclopedia of Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic writers to 1814 have now been published, the last volume appearing this year (Copenhagen, 1924–1934). It is expected that the twelfth and final volume will be published in a few months.

Articles: N. Sykes, *The Study of History* (History, Sept.); K. Lehmann, *Ermattungsstrategie—oder nicht?* (Hist. Zeitsch., Nov. 15); George M. Wrong, *What has befallen us?* (University of Toronto Quar., Oct.); Robert C. Binkley, *An Anatomy of Revolution* (Virginia Quar., Oct.); Heinrich Schreiber, *Bibliothekarische Aufgaben zur Handschriftenerschliessung* [II] (Hist. Vierteljahr., Sept.); Lis Jacobsen, *Om det nye danske Diplomatarium* [the projected Danish diplomatarium] (Dan. Hist. Tidsskr., 1934, nos. 4, 5); Fritz Rörig, *"Territorialwirtschaft und Stadtwirtschaft"* [apropos of a recent work so entitled by H. Spangenberg] (Hist. Zeitsch., Aug.); Carl Neumann, *Ranke und Burckhardt und die Geltung des Begriffes "Renaissance" insbesondere für Deutschland* (*ibid.*); Paul Herre, *Die alte Republik Venedig im Spiegel der jüngsten Geschichtsschreibung* (Preuss. Jahrb., Aug.); Gaston Dodu, *La France et sa capitale: Du danger d'opposer l'une à l'autre* (Rev. Études Hist., July); S. Castel, *Brest, étude de géographie urbaine* [concl'd] (An. Bretagne, XLI, nos. 1, 2); Marjorie L. Daniel, *Woodrow Wilson—Historian* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.).

ANCIENT HISTORY

C. F. A. Shaeffer has published a preliminary report of the fifth campaign at Ras Shamra in *Syria,* XV, no. 2, where there is also a study by H. Seyrig of the monumental bas-reliefs of the temple of Bel at Palmyra. A report of Professor Robinson's recent finds at Olynthus has appeared in the London *Illustrated News* of November 10. Note in the September number of the *American Journal of Archaeology* L. Legrain's Himyarite material recently acquired by the University of Pennsylvania Museum, E. P. Blegen's News Items from Athens, and A. W. Van Buren's annual account of the discoveries of the year in Italy. Note also M. Rostovtzeff's account of the Mithraeum of Doura in *Römische Mitteilungen,* XLIX, nos. 1–2.

Students of economic and social history will be interested in F. Thureau-Dangin's account of a shop for purple wool at Ugarit from a Ras Shamra tablet, in *Syria,* XV, no. 2; G. M. Calhoun's article on classes and masses in Homer, in *Classical Philology* for October; and A. B. West on the two Callias decrees, in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for September.

Græco-Roman Egypt has supplied subjects for several recent articles. W. Otto has published some studies in the politics and the public law of Hellenism in the period of the sixth Ptolemy, in the *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie,* no. 11, 1934. In *Aegyptus* for September appear articles by G. M. Harper, jr., on the relation of *archones, metochoi,* and *engyoi* to each other, to the government, and to the tax contract in Ptolemaic Egypt; by F. Bozza, on matrimony in the law of the papyri of the Ptolemaic period; by S. Avogadro on taxes on cattle in Græco-Roman Egypt; and, from a late period, H. Comfort's notes on requests 'cheirographa' among late Byzantine land leases.

E. Heuss, the author of *Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der römischen Aussenpolitik in republikanischer Zeit* (Klio Beiheft, 31), presents as prolegomena to the study of Roman imperialism a study of *amicitia* and *deditio* in Roman international law. After killing again the theory of 'natural enmity', he develops the position, in opposition to Täubler, that the relation of *amicitia* demands no set form of treaty and can arise through diplomatic contact alone; the formula for a declaration of war implies previous contact and wrongdoing on the part of the offender. A treaty, *amicitiae causa,* might follow upon a friendly contact. Similarly, *deditio* is not a treaty relationship but rather a formal grant of full power over the subject party, who now comes *in dicionem,* and implies no further legal consequence except the removal of the violence of war. How it was used depended upon circumstances at the time, as the instances of Capua in 211, the Aetolians in 190, and, much earlier, the friendly *deditio* of Neapolis all go to show. The author draws the inference that any new arrangement after a *deditio* is therefore a separate act, and that the status of the subject communities in the empire did not depend upon it; that the declaration of the freedom of the Greek cities in 196 was not a constitutive act implying a protectorate, but merely the withdrawal of an authority gained by the *deditio,* and that in the second century B.C. similar grants to cities of freedom without treaty were not the precarious and revocable grants of privileges which they afterwards became. The author has dealt with his problem sensibly, if somewhat ponderously, and is refreshingly aware of a process of development and adaptation in Roman legal conceptions.

The latest of the Picard series of manuals is *Archéologie gallo-romaine,* deuxième partie, *L'archéologie du sol* (pp. 627, 201 engravings, 2 plans, 65 fr.).

Articles: Thomas E. Read, *The Early Casting of Iron: a Stage in Iron Age Civilization* (Geograph. Rev., Oct.); H. Kees, *Zu einigen Fachausdrücken der altägyptischen Provincialverwaltung* (Zeitsch. f. Ægypt. Sprache, 1934); B. L. Ullman, *How Old is the Greek Alphabet?* (Am. Jour. Arch., Sept.); H. Nesselhauf, *Die diplomatische Verhandlungen vor dem peloponnesischen Kriege* (Hermes, LXIX, no. 3); A. Rehm, *Über die sizilischen Bücher des Thucydides* (Philologus, LXXXIX, no. 2); M. Guarducci, *Nuovi contributi alla cronologia degli arconti beotici* (Riv. Filol., Sept.); A. Momigliano, *Manto e l'oraculo di Apollo Clario* (*ibid.*); M. Segre, *Decreto di Aspendos* (Aegyptus, Sept.); G. de Sanctis, *La distruzione di Rhaucos* (Riv. Filol., Sept.); G. Daux, *Sur la date de l'archonte athénien Argeios, 98/7 et 97/6, et la politique religieuse d' Athènes à cette époque* (Rev. Études Grecques, June); R. Besnier, *L'état économique de Rome au temps des rois* (Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr., Sept.); F. della Corte, *L'ambasceria di Cratete a Roma* (Riv. Filol., Sept.); W. Hoffman, *Rom und die griechische Welt im 4 Jahrhundert* (Philologus, Suppl., XXVII, no. 1); A. Alföldi, *Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells am römischen Kaiserhofe* (Röm. Mitteil. XLIX, nos. 1–2); H. W. Kamp, *Concerning Seneca's Exile* (Class. Jour., Nov.); Ronald Syme, *The Spanish War of Augustus, 26–25 B. C.* (Am. Jour. Philol., Oct.).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: Charles Bémont, *Histoire de Grande-Bretagne: Moyen Age* (Rev. Hist., July).

Two dissertations in the Medieval field have been published by the Catholic University of America. James Bernard Walker in *The "Chronicles" of Saint Antoninus: a Study in Historiography* (1933, pp. ix, 171) examines the manuscripts and editions of the Chronicles, gives an analysis of each of the twenty-four titles, a detailed account of the sources on which Antoninus based his work, and a criticism of "the purpose, the method, the concepts that entered into the composition". An interesting part of the work deals with Antoninus's attitude toward the legend of the 'popess Joan' and his treatment of the problems of the reign of Constantine—especially the Donation. *Sister* Agnes Bernard Cavanagh in her dissertation *Pope Gregory VII and the Theocratic State* (pp. xiv, 143), says that her purpose is "to show that . . . Gregory merely strove to uphold certain principles regarding the relation of the Church and State, which far from impairing, tended rather to support and to strengthen the rights and authority of civil government". E. D. S.

Oxford Theology and Theologians, circa 1282 to 1302, which is vol. XCVI of the Oxford Historical Society, is a study of three manuscripts, the first containing 230 *questiones,* the second 128 sermons in Latin, and the third, a note-

book of a student at Oxford and Paris. The comments and explanations for the first two come from F. Pelster, S. J., and those for the third from Dr. A. G. Little. The writer of the notebook evidently rushed from one lecture room to another, jotting down subjects, arguments, and names of the disputants. The documents testify to a theological activity which gave Oxford a leading position in the period.

Sir George Reresby Sitwell, baronet, in *Tales of my Native Village: being Studies of Medieval Life, Manners, Art, Minstrelsy, and Religion, in the Form of Short Stories* (Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. 229, $5.00) presents a picture of Medieval life centered at Eckington, Derbyshire. This is the place where, he tells us in the preface, "for more than seventy years" he has been "lord of the manor". The point of view of the author also is stated in the preface; he will dwell "upon the beauty and wisdom, rather than upon the follies superstitions and cruelties of the Gothic world". The story element referred to in the title is reduced to the minimum and each of the sections is made up mainly of descriptions based on sources and woven together by the author. In fact the first sketch, called "The Lord of the Manor", is so burdened with proper names and genealogical connections that there is no unified effect given. That is not true of the others, particularly of "The Feast" and "The Pilgrim". Each sketch is laid in a special period, the time ranging from 1258 to 1370. One of the sources used by the author and one of the most interesting parts of the book is the copies of illuminations; they alone would make the work valuable. E. D. S.

The *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III, 1259–1261* (35*s*.) has been published by H. M. Stationery Office.

An important volume for the study of papal procedure in the Middle Ages is *Public Notaries and the Papal Curia: a Calendar and a Study of a "Formularium notariorum curie" from the Early Years of the Fourteenth Century* (Macmillan, 30*s*.), by Geoffrey Barraclough, of the British School at Rome. The editor believes that this formulary was completed about 1327, at the time, therefore, when the papal court was at Avignon. The administrative business of the court was efficiently managed, although the reader of Medieval history associates the Babylonian Captivity with something quite different.

A work of great significance for the history of Estonia is an elaborate study of more than one thousand pages by Paul Johansen entitled *Die Estlandliste des Liber Census Daniae* (Copenhagen and Reval, 1933). The Estland "lists" are certain materials, chiefly statistical, which were incorporated with other more pertinent materials in a sort of Danish Domesday Book. The lists are from the thirteenth century and yield information on many subjects, among which are agrarian conditions, urban geography, and the Estonian aristocracy. L. M. L.

Brattahlid, by Poul Nörlund and Mårten Stenberger, is the report of an extensive historical and archæological research (undertaken in the summer of 1932) into Norse culture in Greenland in the Middle Ages. The book is published in English and takes its name from the home of Eric the Red (Meddelelser om Grönland, LXXXVIII, No. 1; Copenhagen, C. A. Reitzel, pp. 161, kr. 8).

The initial volume of an important collection of material on Swiss origins, *Quellenwerk zur Entstehung der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft* is entitled *Urkunden: Von den Anfängen bis Ende 1291,* edited by Traugott Schiess. There are to be two other sections, "Quellen der Tradition nebst Vorgeschichte", and "Sage und bildliche Darstellung". One feature of the former is the elements of tradition from its earliest known forms to the first "Bearbeitungen" in the sixteenth century. The volume published calendars 1695 documents, which is about five times as many as were included in Oechsli's *Anfängen der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft* published forty years ago.

A recent contribution to the history of the earlier *Drang nach Osten* is a small publication by Erich Maschke with the title *Polen und die Berufung des Deutschen Ordens nach Preussen* (Danzig, Danziger Verlagsgesellschaft, pp. 84, 2.10 M.).

A biography of Bertrand du Guesclin, composed in the style of a romance by the French novelist Roger Vercel, has been translated by Marion Saunders, and published, with an introduction by Professor John M. S. Allison, by the Yale University Press (pp. xii, 257, $3.00).

To the series Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Age has been added *Thomas Basin: Histoire de Charles VII* (Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1933, vol. I, pp. xlvii, 309), edited by Charles Samaran, professor in the École des chartes. There is an extended introduction and the Latin text is provided, page by page, with a translation. This volume covers the years 1407–1444.

Articles: P. Galtier, *A propos de la Pénitence primitive: Méthodes et conclusions* [cont'd] (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., July); Edm. Liénard, *Un courtisan de Théodose* [C. R. Albinus] (Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist., June); Jacques Zeiller, *L'arianisme en Afrique avant l'invasion vandale* (Rev. Hist., May); Charles Verlinden, *Problèmes d'histoire économique franque* [II]: *L'état économique de l'Alsace sous Louis le Pieux d'après Ernold le Noir* (Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist., June); F. Frahm, *Grabungen und Forschungen aus der Wikingerzeit der Schleswiger Landenge* (Hist. Zeitsch., Nov. 15); Ch. Edmond Perrin, *Une étage de la seigneurie: L'exploitation de la réserve à Prüm, au IX^e siècle* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Sept.); Arno Duch, *Über die Annalen von St. Blasien* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Sept.); Ét. Sabbe, *Quelques types*

de marchands des IX^e^ et X^e^ siècles (Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist., June); Oscar Albert Johnsen, *Norges handel og skibsfart i middelalderen* [Norwegian trade and navigation in the Middle Ages] (Nordisk Kultur, XVI); Vilh. la Cour, *Adam af Bremens Meddelelser om Sven Estridsson* [Adam of Bremen's account of Sven Estridsson] (Dan. Hist. Tidsskr., 1934, nos. 4–5); Johannes Steenstrup, *Flertal og Mindretal* [majority and minority: a study of electoral methods in Denmark in the Middle Ages] (*ibid.*); Erik Lönnroth, *Engelbrekt* (Scandia, 1934, no. 1); Lauritz Weibull, *Upptäckten av den skandinaviska Norden* [early information about the Scandinavian North] (*ibid.*); A. Mollard, *La diffusion de l'Institution oratoire au XII^e^ siècle* (Moyen Age, Sept.); S. E. Thorne, *Le droit canonique en Angleterre* [reign of Henry II] (Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr., Sept.); E. C. Lodge, *The Relations between England and Gascony, 1152–1453* [Historical Revision, LXX] (History, Sept.); Matteo Gaudioso, *Ricerche sul trasferimento dei beni immobili in Sicilia nei Secoli XII-XIV* (Arch. Stor. per la Sicilia Orientale, XXX, no. 1); Vincenz Samanek, *Der angebliche Verrat Adolfs von Nassau* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Apr.); Mario Gasco, *Pareri dati al marchese Gian Francesco Gonzaga nel 1430 circa la ricostruzione economica dello Stato* (Riv. Stor. Ital., July); Gaillard Lapsley, *The Parliamentary Title of Henry IV* [II] (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); H. L. Gray, *Incomes from Land in England in 1436* (*ibid.*); Jules de la Martinière, *Frère Richard et Jeanne d'Arc à Orléans, mars-juillet, 1430* (Moyen Age, Sept.); M. A. Andreeva, *Zur Reise Manuels II Palaiologos nach Westeuropa* (Byzant. Zeitsch., XLIII, no. 1); E. Weigand, *Neuere Forschungen zur byzantinoslavischen Kunst der Balkanlander* (*ibid.*); Richard Henning, *Das Christentum im mittelalterlichen Asien und sein Einfluss auf die Sage vom "Priester Johannes"* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Sept.); O. Greiffenhagen, *Hochmittelalter an der nördlichen Ostsee* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., IV, no. 4); L. Arbusow, *Zur Würdigung der Kultur Altlivlands im Mittelalter und 16. Jahrhundert* (Hist. Zeitsch., Nov. 15); Pierre Petot, *La preuve du servage en Champagne* (Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr., Sept.).

Documents: H. Matrod, tr., *L'itinéraire de Fr. Symon Symonis et de son compagnon Fr. Hugues l'Enlumineur O. F. M.* [translation, to be continued, of extracts from an account of a trip from Dublin to Venice, 1323–1324] (Études Francis., Aug.).

FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

The memory of Jacques Cartier and of the other French discoverers and pioneers of Canada is celebrated in the articles of the September number of the *Revue des questions historiques*. Among the contributors are Dr. H. P. Biggar, and MM. R. La Roque de Roquebrune, Emmanuel de Cathelineau, and Edmund Buron.

The second volume of the *History of the Church of Ireland* (Oxford

University Press), which Walter Alison Phillips is editing, deals mainly with the period of the Reformation. The author of this section of the volume is Canon Jourdan, professor of Ecclesiastical history in the University of Dublin. There is to be a further volume.

The *Bulletin de la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, vol. V, no. 5, is chiefly devoted to a monograph by Henri Naef on Bezanson Hugues, including his posterity and his friends in the adjoining canton of Freiburg. Wealthy merchant and official during the period when Geneva was threatened from without by Savoy and torn internally by the impending Reformation, Hugues played a most important part in the preservation of the independence of the state by forming an alliance with Freiburg and other significant measures. The author disclaims any attempt to write a biography but with his outline of this career he discusses numerous obscure dates and events which have caused controversy and brings to his aid many documents hitherto unpublished. J. M. V.

In *Die spanische Inquisition und die "Alumbrados"* (Berlin, Dummler) Bernardino Llorca, S. J., has added somewhat to the knowledge of the treatment of the pseudo-mystics by the Inquisition. The author distinguishes three types, the sincere, the disequilibrated, and those whose air of sanctity was a handy covering for other qualities. It is a curious fact that no one was punished with death.

Vol. II of the late John Viénot's *Histoire de la Réforme française* (Fischbacher, 75 fr.) has now appeared. The period covered is indicated by the subtitle, *De l'Édit de Nantes à sa révocation, 1598–1685*.

Articles: Mustafa Ziada, *The Mamlūḳ Conquest of Cyprus in the Fifteenth Century* [II] (University of Egypt, Bull. Faculty of Arts, May); Hans Kramer, *Untersuchungen über die "Commentarii" des Papstes Pius II* (Mitteil. des Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf., XLVIII, nos. 1–2); August Loehr, *Der Wandel des Münzbildes auf österreichischen Dukaten* (*ibid.*); R. Stewart-Brown, *The Cheshire Writs of Quo Warranto in 1499* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); B. Behrens, *Origins of the Office of English Resident Ambassador in Rome* (*ibid.*); Gustavo Giovannoni, *Bramante da Urbino e l'architettura italiana* (N. Antol., Oct. 1); T. S. R. Boase, *Italian Studies* (History, Sept.); George E. Nunn, *Magellan's Route in the Pacific* (Geograph. Rev., Oct.); D. J. de Groot, *Melchior Volmar: Ses relations avec les réformateurs français et suisses* (Bull. Soc. Hist. Prot. Fr., July); Charles Mercier, *Les théories politiques des calvinistes en France au cours des guerres de religion* (*ibid.*, Apr., July); John Horsch, *The Character of the Evangelical Anabaptists as reported by Contemporary Reformation Writers* (Mennonite Quar. Rev., July); Adair G. Williams, *The Absolution of Henry of Navarre* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.).

Documents: Émile G. Léonard, ed., *Protestants français poursuivis par l'Inquisition dans l'Italie méridionale au XVI^e siècle* (Bull. Soc. Hist. Prot. Fr., July).

SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

The new volume of the Hakluyt Society deals with the period of the buccaneers. It is Lionel Wafer's *A New Voyage and Description of the Isthmus of America,* edited by Mrs. L. E. Elliott Joyce. The volume also includes Wafer's "Secret Report" to the Duke of Leeds in 1698 and Davis's Expedition to the Gold Mines (1704). Quaritch is the publisher (31*s.* 6*d.*).

Mitteilungen des Vereines für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen, LXXII, nos. 1–2, is devoted to a commemoration of the tercentenary of Wallenstein's death, containing among others these articles: Josef Bergl, *Die Schicksale der Reliquien Wallensteins, seiner ersten Gemahlin und seines Sohnes;* Johann Richter, *Die Wallenstein-Bronzen des prager Wallenstein-Palais;* A. Ernstberger, *Wallenstein und Chimicus Eckhardt* [with documents]; Josef Bergl, *Ausgew. Bildnisse Waldsteins, seiner Anhänger u. seiner Gegner.*

Elizabeth W. Gilboy's *Wages in Eighteenth Century England* (Harvard University Press) is an attempt to arrive at the "real wages" in that century in the metropolitan area and in selected northern and western counties. The author used the county records of quarter sessions to supplement the more conventional sources.

It is a disconcerting picture of one of the circumstances attendant upon revolution and war which the eminent French historian Marcel Marion draws in *Le brigandage pendant la Révolution* (Plon, pp. xiii, 253, 12 fr.). The Old Régime had been afflicted with a similar curse, because the salt tax almost made of lawbreaking a career, but the evil was bound to be increased by the flotsam of the revolutionary flood. Professor Marion shows that toward the close of the decade, when conditions in the army became extremely wretched, the bands of brigands were recruited from deserters and from young men who sought to avoid conscription. The country had to await the firm hand of the First Consul before brigandage was abated and the conditions which caused it were measurably corrected.

In a recent study of the Navigation Act of 1651 Oscar Albert Johnsen reaches the conclusion that the act was not aimed at the Dutch trade, which was at the time practically non-existent in English ports, but was intended as a defensive measure against a possible attempt on the part of the Dutch to regain their earlier position (*Navigasjonsakten av 1651,* Avhandlinger utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps—Akademi i Oslo [publications of the Norwegian Academy of Science], II, no. 2). L. M. L.

The Torrington Diaries, of which the first volume has appeared (Eyre and Spottiswoode), edited by C. Bruyn Andrews, with a general introduction by John Beresford, are the work of John Byng, fifth Viscount Torrington, nephew of the admiral who was shot. The diarist was a traveler over England and Wales in the period 1781–1794; his observations are chiefly of interest to students of social history and to antiquarians.

Two recent additions to the great collection of cahiers published by the commission on the economic history of the French Revolution are: *Cahiers de doléances des généralités de Metz et de Nancy pour les États généraux de 1789,* tome IV, *Cahiers du bailliage de Nancy,* edited by Jean Godfrin; *Cahiers de doléances de la colonie de Saint-Domingue pour les États généraux de 1789,* edited by Blanche Maurel, both published by Ernest Leroux.

The Centre d'études de la Révolution, of which Professor Philippe Sagnac is the director, has issued a second volume of *Cahiers de la Révolution française,* with the subtitle of *L'influence de la Révolution française sur la Suisse, le département du Léman* (Recueil Sirey, pp. 74, 10 fr.), edited by Édouard Chapuisat.

F. Braesch has made an important contribution to the history of the finances of the French Revolution in *Finances et monnaies révolutionnaires: Première partie, les exercices budgétaires 1790 et 1791, d'après les comptes du Trésor* (Nancy, G. Thomas, 30 fr.).

A recent life of Gaspard Monge, the mathematician, under the title of *Un grand Français, Monge, fondateur de l'École politechnique* (Editions Pierre Roger), by Louis de Launay, is important because of the large number of unpublished letters, written by Monge to his wife and to one of his friends, which have been utilized. The author has also consulted a biography written by Monge's son-in-law, and which has hitherto remained in manuscript.

Articles: J. R. Powell, *Blake and the Defence of Lyme Regis* (Mariner's Mirror, Oct.); W. H. Dawson, *Cromwell and the Jews* (Quar. Rev., Oct.); Arménag Sakisian, *A propos de deux médailles arméniennes de 1673 à l'effigie d'un marchand de Djoulfa, près Ispahan* (Rev. Hist., July); J. Kleyntjens, *Une ambassade polonaise en 1633* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., July); Paul Canestrier, *Comment M. de Tessé prépara en 1696 le traité de paix entre la France et la Savoie* (*ibid.*); Leonhard Stejneger, *An Early Account of Bering's Voyages* (Geograph. Rev., Oct.); Veit Valentin, *Some Interpretations of Frederick the Great* (History, Sept.); Werner Philipp, *Ivan Peresvetov und seine Pläne zu einer Erneuerung des moskauer Staates* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., IV, no. 4); Paul Baud, *Les origines de la grande industrie chimique en France* (Rev. Hist., July); Blanche Maurel, *Un député de Saint-Domingue à la Constituante: J. B. Gérard* (Rev. Hist. Mod., May); Edmond Soreau, *Les hommes de finance pendant la Révolution* [with list of bankers and

brokers] (Rev. Études Hist., July); Y. Forado-Cunéo, *Les ateliers de charité pendant la Révolution française* [concl'd] (Rév. Fr., Apr.); M. L. Blumer, *La Commission pour la recherche des objets de sciences et arts en Italie, 1796–1797* [II] (*ibid.*); Hamilton Pegg, *Sentiments républicains dans la presse parisienne lors de la fuite du Roi* (An. Hist. Rév. Fr., Sept.); Albert Mathiez, *Le lendemain du 10 août* [posthumous] (*ibid.*); Paul Nicolle, *Les meutres politiques d'août et septembre dans le département de l'Orne* [concl'd] (*ibid.*, May); Robert Schnerb, *Les lois de ventôse et leur application dans le département du Puy-de-Dôme* (*ibid.*, Sept.); [ ] Bouloiseau, *Les comités de surveillance des arrondissements parisiens* [I] (*ibid.*, May); F. Vermale, *La mission de Gauthier dans les Hautes et Basses-Alpes, après le 9 thermidor* (*ibid.*); Michel Eude, *La commune Robespierriste* (*ibid.*, July); Antoine Richard, *L'armée des Pyrénées occidentale et les représentants en Espagne, 1794–1795* (*ibid.*); Lucien Leclerc, *La trahison des colons aristocrates de Saint-Domingue* (*ibid.*, July); H. A. Shannon, *Bricks: a Trade Index, 1785–1849* (Economica, Aug.); G. E. Fussell, *Francis Forbes, a Real Eighteenth Century Book Farmer* (Notes and Queries, Sept. 22).

Documents: P. de Barante, ed., *Lettre de Mme. de la Briche et du comte de Crillon au roi Louis XVI du 25 avril 1792* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., July); Émile Dard, ed., *Une lettre inédite de la comtesse Tyskievitch à Talleyrand* (*ibid.*); Jane Lohrer, ed., *A Letter of Brissot to Desmoulins* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.).

HISTORY SINCE 1800

General review: Chester W. Clark, *The Foreign Policy of Prussia, 1858–1871* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.).

Readers of G. Lacour-Gayet's *Talleyrand* will be pleasantly surprised to learn that the author has discovered new material for a fourth volume entitled *Mélanges* (Payot, 30 fr.). Among other things this volume discusses Talleyrand's alleged sale to Austria of letters of Napoleon.

To its Bibliothèque historique the Librairie Plon has now added *Napoléon souverain de l'Ile d'Elbe*, by Pons de l'Hérault, and the *Mémoires du Maréchal Joffre*, somewhat reduced from the original edition in two volumes, but containing the essential passages (each 15 fr.).

Friedrich von Gentz' Relations with the British Government during the Marquis Wellesley's Foreign Secretaryship of State, from 1809 to 1812, by C. S. B. Buckland (London, Macmillan, 1933, pp. 40), supplements the author's *Metternich and the British Government from 1809 to 1813* (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 746). It is based upon hitherto unused manuscripts in the Public Record Office and occasional selections from Gentz's copious diary. Where the archives falter the author has not hesitated to make

hypotheses, albeit cautious ones. For years Gentz had been the recipient of subsidies from the British government for his brilliant interpretations of the British in Teutonic Europe and his bold literary assaults on Bonaparte. When Wellesley entered Downing Street, the German publicist was turned adrift. The causes for this discharge appear to the writer as: penny-wise economy; Gentz's temporary espousal of compromise with Bonaparte; skepticism regarding Gentz's ability to establish intimate contacts with Austria's new helmsman, Metternich. Mr. Buckland persuasively interprets Wellesley's behavior as unjustifiably cruel and crude. In letters, almost piteous in tone, the financially desperate Gentz vainly sought to restore himself to favor. Finally, Johnson, unofficial British observer at Vienna, convinced the foreign office that Gentz's political opinions were on a plane with Caesar's wife and that as the confidant of Metternich he could accomplish great good for the "Good Cause". Though restored to the British pay roll, Gentz never forgot Wellesley's churlish policy. This slender monograph adds a solid chapter to the biography of Gentz and a substantial footnote to the diplomacy of the Napoleonic era. A. J. M.

The Bibliothèque d'histoire coloniale has added to its series Victor Jacquemont's comments on *L'état politique et social de l'Inde du Sud en 1832* (Leroux, pp. xxviii, 168, 35 fr.), extracted from his "Journal de Voyage". Alfred Martineau has written an introduction. This is a companion volume to *L'état politique et social de l'Inde du Nord en 1830,* by the same writer.

As a companion series to *Das auswärtige Politik Preussens,* the distinguished Austrian historian H. Ritter von Srbik, with the assistance of O. Schmid, has begun the publication of *Quellen zur deutschen Politik Österreichs, 1859–1866.* The first volume covers the period from July, 1859, to November, 1861 (Oldenburg, Stalling, pp. xxi, 811, 52 M.).

The Société de l'histoire des colonies has published the journal written during the course of the Madagascar expedition by Alfred Durand who because of his knowledge of the Hova tongue served as "lieutenant interprète". He was one of the first to enter Tananarive and in 1897 was assigned the task of conducting the exiled queen, Ranavalo, to La Réunion. The volume is entitled *La derniers jours de la cour Hova: L'exil de la reine Ranavalo* (Leroux, 1933, pp. 166).

The first two volumes of the *Journals and Letters of Reginald, Viscount Esher,* edited by Maurice V. Brett (Ivor Nicholson and Watson), cover the interesting years, 1870–1910. It promises to be another of the intimate sources indispensable to historians ambitious to give a personal flavor to their accounts of political and court life.

In *Foreign Affairs* for October Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt has discussed at length the evidence on the origins of the World War made available

in the German authorized translation of the Russian *Die internationalen Beziehungen im Zeitalter des Imperialismus: Dokumente aus den Archiven der zarischen und der provisorischen Regierung* (first series, 1878–1914, 5 vols.). A new series has now been opened, with a German official translation, the first volume covering the period from the outbreak of the war until November 1, 1914. The German sponsor, as before, is Professor Hoetzsch. In this volume out of 448 documents 324 are hitherto unpublished. The principal topics are concerned with the attitude of states at the beginning neutral, Turkey, the Balkan states, Italy, and the United States.

Admiral Mark Kerr's volume on *Prince Louis of Battenberg, Admiral of the Fleet* (Longmans, 10*s.* 6*d.*) is of special interest for the history of the British fleet at the opening of the World War. It will be recalled that he was forced to retire in October, 1914, because of his German birth although a grandson of Queen Victoria. Much of the readiness of the British fleet for the struggle was due to his activity after 1912, and his bold cancellation on July 26 of the order of demobilization saved the fleet from being dispersed at the moment war broke out.

The new volume of *Documents diplomatiques français relatifs aux origines de la guerre de 1914* is tome VII of the third series and covers the period from May 31 to August 10, 1913.

In a volume on *Pourquoi Arras ne fut pas pris, 1914* (Plon, pp. x, 225, 13 fr. 50), General H. Mordacq describes vividly the incidents of a tragic struggle for a key position, the loss of which might have entailed that of Calais and Boulogne. The hero of the conflict was General Bardot, who fell in the hour of success. As General Mordacq himself took part in the operations his narrative has something of the flavor of personal reminiscences. Arras, Marshal Pétain explains in the preface, became a part of the new French front, and because of the hills round about, including Vimy, was essential for any future drive toward the plains of Douai and Lille.

Vol. II of tome VIII, *Les armées françaises dans la Grande Guerre* deals with *La campagne d'Orient de l'intervention de la Roumanie aux préparatifs d'offensive de 1918, août, 1916—avril, 1918.* There are four volumes of annexes and two pocket cases of maps. The price is 550 francs.

Professor André Fauconnet's *Études sur l'Allemagne* (Félix Alcan, pp. xiii, 201, 15 fr.) deals primarily with literature, but one essay undertakes to explain psychologically the failure of the German military leaders in the battle of the Marne. He finds the cause in the narrow conception which they entertained of the motives which would influence the commander of the Paris garrison, General Galliéni. General Galliéni was not a mere soldier, bound by his duty as defender of a great fortified city. To the surprise of the

Germans he utilized the resources of his command to play a decisive part in the field campaign.

In *An Autobiography* (2 vols., Ivor Nicholson and Watson), by Philip, Viscount Snowden, we have an illuminating contribution to the history of the Labour party, of which the author has been so distinguished a member. The first volume deals both with his early career and with the formation of the party. The second covers the years 1919–1932, especially the two Labour ministries.

The history of the new Baltic states is traced in brief outline by Jean Meuvret in his *Histoire des pays baltiques, Lituanie—Lettonie—Estonie—Finlande* (Paris, Colin, pp. 203, 10 fr. 50).

The first six chapters of C. B. Fawcett's *A Political Geography of the British Empire* (Ginn, 1933, pp. xiii, 409, $4.50) present useful generalizations on the politico-geographical problems of the greatest of world states. One or two of the succeeding chapters are given to each of the members of the Commonwealth and their more important dependencies; the smaller scattered dependencies are grouped together in one chapter; and the book closes with a discussion of "some of the world relations of the British Empire". Even the historian is bound to notice that the material given does not fully fit the definition of political geography as the science of relations between things political and things geographical. The total impression received is of regional geography rather than of relationships or what used to be called the "philosophy of geography". The chapters on South Africa seem the least subject to any such criticism. Those on Australia, also, bring out successfully the interlocking of such factors as isolation, relief, rainfall, cultivable land, population capacity, "White Australia", and defense. Every chapter has information helpful to the historian teaching a course in the development of the British empire; all of it written in an easy style and much of it not available in any other equally convenient form. Maps of empire airways or of recent political boundaries in the south polar region, for example, are not to be laid hands on everywhere. Many of the maps, in fact, are unusual, particularly the antipodal map and the "skew" maps of the world centered on the region being described. That type of diagram focused on Canberra gives a statement of Australia's isolation more convincing than pages of print. J. B.

Professor Manley O. Hudson's *The World Court, 1921–1934: a Handbook of the Permanent Court of International Justice* (World Peace Foundation, pp. viii, 302, $2.50) has reached a fourth edition. As a member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, as well as professor of international law at Harvard, no one could analyze with greater authority the decisions of the court. The student of recent European history will find this little book

indispensable not only for the record that it embodies, but also for the points of view from which the judges considered certain great international questions, as, for example, the proposal of a customs union between Austria and Germany. The publishers offer an edition in paper, without the index, for 75 cents.

The International Publishers have issued a brief biography of Lenin under the title of *Life and Teachings of Lenin* (pp. 95, 50 cents), by R. Palme Dutt, and a small volume entitled *Fundamental Laws of the Chinese Soviet Republic* (pp. 87, 75 cents), with an introduction by Bela Kun.

The Foreign Policy Association is the sponsor of a volume on the *New Governments in Europe: the Trend toward Dictatorship* (Nelson, pp. xiv, 440, $2.50). Raymond Leslie Buell has written the introductions and the authors of the sections on Italy, Germany, the Baltic States, the Soviet Republics, and Spain, are Vera Micheles Dean, Mildred S. Wertheimer, Malbone W. Graham, and Bailey W. Diffie.

Les régimes électoraux [Collection Armand Colin, section de droit] (Paris, Colin, pp. 223, 10 fr. 50), by Georges Lachapelle, the well-known writer on government and finance, deals primarily with French practices, but has sections on usage in other countries, among them the United States. Our competence in organizing the machinery of elections does not impress the French observer. He remarks that if, as alleged, we offer the example of a true democracy, "il faudrait en conclure que, de toutes les formes de gouvernement, la démocratie serait peut-être la plus immorale". He also discovers an interesting relation between congressional elections and Federal finance. "Pour être nommé par l'appui nécessaire des comités de politiciens professionnels, il faut multiplier les promesses démagogiques, puis les tenir après l'élection". M. Lachapelle, therefore, is not surprised at our menacing deficits in time of economic crisis. Probably the chapter which will be read with the greatest interest is the one dealing with proportional representation, of which the author has long been the champion.

Europe between Wars? (Macmillan, pp. 115, $1.25), by Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of *Foreign Affairs,* is a careful handling of the sticks of dynamite which miscellaneous dictators have left about Europe. It is mainly these which accentuate the problems of the French people, effectively stated in the chapter on "How will France choose?" "Wotan chases Apollo" is the subject of another chapter which presents the alternative before the democratic nations which still remain.

Articles: E. J. Knapton, *Some Aspects of the Bourbon Restoration of 1814* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.); Nora E. Hudson, *The Circulation of the Ultra-Royalist Press under the French Restoration* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); Charles Dupuis, *La Sainte Alliance et le directoire européen de 1815 à*

1818 (Rev. Hist. Dipl., July); M. Braubach, *Vom Ende des alten Reichs bis zur Reichsgründung Bismarcks* (Hist. Jahrb., 1934, no. 3); Michel Huisman, *Quelques dessous de la Conférence de Londres: Talleyrand a-t-il trafiqué de son influence?* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Aug.); C. K. Webster, *Lord Palmerston at Work, 1830–1841* (Politica, Aug.); Frederick Merk, *The British Corn Crisis and the Oregon Treaty* (Agricultural Hist., July); Hermann Ibler, *Die Wahlen zur frankfurter Nationalversammlung in Oesterreich 1848; mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Steiermark* (Mitteil. des Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf., XLVIII, nos. 1–2); Ernesto Pontieri, *Aspetti e tendenze dell' assolutismo napoletano* (Riv. Stor. Ital., July); Harold Temperley, *The Alleged Violations of the Straits Convention by Stratford de Redcliffe between June and September, 1853* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Oct.); G. B. Henderson, *Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung der napoleonischen Idee über Polen und Italien während des Krimkrieges* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., IV, no. 4); Joseph Feldman, *Bismarck et la question polonaise* (Rev. Hist., May); Vittorio Cian, *Gli alfieriani-foscoliani piemontesi ed il romanticismo del primo Risorgimento* (Rassegna Stor. Risorgimento Ital., July); Cesare M. de Vecchi di Val Cismon, *Del generale Paolo Solaroli, del re Vittorio Emanuele II, di una missione segreta nel 1859 e di altre cose ancora* [documents from the Solaroli archives to show how the English pushed Italy toward annexations in Central Italy in 1860] (*ibid.*); Carlo Zaghi, *Nuovi documenti sul congresso di Reggio e di Modena* [with bibliographical review] (*ibid.*, May); Piero Zama, *L'edizione nazionale degli scritti di Giuseppe Garibaldi* (*ibid.*); Frank E. Ross, *The American Naval Attack on Shimonoseki in 1863* (Chinese Soc. and Pol. Sci. Rev., Apr.); Friedrich Frahm, *Frankreich und die Hohenzollernkandidatur bis zum Frühjahr 1869* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Sept.); Patrick Bury, *Gambetta et l'Angleterre* (Rev. Hist., July); Jean Dietz, *Jules Ferry et les traditions républicaines* [IV] (Rev. Pol. et Parl., Sept. 10); R. Schnir, *Un épisode du ralliement: Contribution à l'étude des rapports de l'Église et l'État sous la IIIe République* (Rev. Hist. Mod., May, Aug.); Robert J. Lemoine, *Finances et colonisation: La concentration des entreprises dans la mise en valeur du Congo belge* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Sept.); Raymond W. Bixler, *Anglo-Portuguese Rivalry for Delagoa Bay* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Dec.); Raymond Beazley, *Britain and Germany in the Salisbury-Caprivi Era, 1890–1892* (Berl. Monatsh., Oct.); Rudolf Kiszling, *Die Entwicklung der österreichisch-ungarischen Wehrmacht seit der Annexionskrise 1908* (*ibid.*, Sept.); Otto Hoetzsch, *Die erste Reihe der russischen Vorkriegsakten* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., IV, no. 4); Sidney B. Fay, *Amerikanisch-französische Kriegsschulddiskussion: Jules Isaac, Un débat historique, 1914* (Berl. Monatsh., Nov.); Graf Westarp, *Aus meinen Erinnerungen: Die Revolution von unten im letzten Jahrzehnt des Kaiserreiches: Zweiter Teil, von 1914 bis 1918* (Preuss. Jahrb., July, Aug.); Ferdinand Friedensburg, *Die Zerstö-*

rung der französischen Kohlengruben als Vorwand für die Saarbestimmungen des versailler Vertrages (*ibid.*, Oct.); Hans Kohn, *The Unification of Arabia* (Foreign Affairs, Oct.); Carl Snyder, *Commodity Prices versus General Price Level* [for the last century] (Am. Ec. Rev., Sept.); Walter Sandelins, *Dictatorship and Irresponsible Parliamentarism—A Study in the Government of Sweden* (Pol. Sci. Quar., Sept.); Michael T. Florinsky, *France and the War Debts* (*ibid.*); R. Coupland, *British Tropical Africa* (University of Toronto Quar., Oct.).

Documents: Francesco Salata, ed., *Napoleone Francesco, re di Roma: Lettere ad Antonio Prokesch* (N. Antol., Sept. 16).

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, the following may be noted: an account book of the Manufacturing Society of Philadelphia, 1788–1790; thirteen boxes of papers of Elizur Wright and family, mostly 1820–1885; twenty-five volumes and seven boxes of papers of Elisha Riggs, mostly 1830–1850; some 60 letters of John Hamilton from Texas, 1838–1866; three volumes of papers of Henry Clay Wood, assistant adjutant general, U. S. A., 1838–1907; additions to the papers of Benjamin Harrison, and papers relating to him, 1858–1919; 160 Civil War letters of William Hamilton of Harrisburg, 1861–1865; about 860 papers of Rounsevelle Wildman, consul at Hong Kong, 1897–1900, and of Edwin Wildman in China; forty-one boxes of papers of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (later the National Society for Vocational Education), 1906–1923; about 102 papers of George F. Kunz relating to bridges and tunnels across the Hudson River, etc., 1910–1919; twelve boxes of the Alaskan Engineering Commission and Alaska Railroad and River Boat Service, 1915–1924; twenty-eight boxes of papers relating to international traffic in opium, 1919–1933; inventories of archives and of newspapers of counties of Alabama, 1934; and the customary additions of photocopies from the archives of London, Paris, and Seville.

The United States Department of Agriculture has issued a *Bibliography of Land Settlement, with particular Reference to Small Holdings and Subsistence Homesteads* (pp. iv, 492), compiled by Louise O. Bercaw, A. M. Hannay, and Esther M. Colvin.

In vol. XVIII, pt. II of *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* appears an essay of great interest on "Special Collections for the Study of History and Literature in the Southeast", by Louis R. Wilson and R. B. Downs. As used here the "Southeast" does not include Maryland, but does Kentucky. Another paper, by Sidney A. Kinber, deals with "The

'Relation of a Late Expedition to St. Augustine', with Biographical and Bibliographical Notes on Isaac and Edward Kimber". The "Relation" was a rare pamphlet telling the story of Oglethorpe's counterattack on the Spaniards in 1743.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Association has issued *A Topical Guide to the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, Volumes I-XIX, 1914–1932, and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association Proceedings, Volumes I-XI, 1907–1924,* compiled by Charles H. Norby and Walker D. Wyman, under the direction of Louis Pelzer. The price to members of the association is $1.00, to non-members, $2.00.

The late Professor Latané's *History of American Foreign Policy* (Doubleday, Doran, pp. xvi, 862, $4.00), widely known for its clarity and candor since its publication in 1897 (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXII, 887), has been revised and enlarged by David W. Wainhouse, Carnegie Fellow in International Law, six supplementary chapters bringing it up to date. In these 131 pages, replacing the former concluding chapter, the implicit criticism of the Senate and the emphasis on international coöperation express the conviction, held firmly by Professor Latané, that isolation is impossible and leadership an obligation. Only minute changes appear in the original portion. The few paragraphs extending the sections on Hispanic American relations seem insufficient. The numerous bibliographical omissions in the original cause one to question the wisdom of reissuing it without major revisions. Surely to reprint the inadequate "Note on sources" with no indication of the extensive publications since 1927 is lamentable. Seven maps comprise the best innovation. P. C. B.

No student of diplomatic relations or of the history of the slave trade can afford to neglect Dr. Hugh G. Soulsby's *The Right of Search and the Slave Trade in Anglo-American Relations, 1814–1862* [Johns Hopkins University Studies, series LI, no. 2, 1933]. It is a substantial and informative account of the long-continued negotiations over the right of search. The stubborn determination of the United States to yield nothing to British maritime demands, the futility of the squadrons of England and America on the African coast, the abandonment of the British claim, and the final concession of the right of search by the United States are followed with clarity despite the mass of detail here recorded. One may grant to the United States that her policy in refusing to admit the right of search was entirely consistent with the doctrine of the freedom of the seas, but it cannot be denied that her position greatly increased the difficulty of ending the slave trade. E. D.

Thomas Mason, Adventurer (Winston, pp. xi, 266, $2.50), by Henry Pleasants, jr., is a biography, embellished by imaginary conversations after the manner of the romancers, dealing with a picturesque character of the Revolutionary period. The narrative is based upon Mason's journal, ship registers, and other documents.

Stephen Foster, America's Troubadour (Crowell, pp. xiii, 445, $3.50), by John Tasker Howard, is the author's second book dealing with America's music. He has done an immense amount of research work in his successful attempt to clear up the many disputed points in the life of our well-known melodist. It should be of great interest to the musical historian and of somewhat less interest to those concerned with the local political history of Pittsburgh in the 1840's and 1850's, for the members of the Foster family, including Stephen, were quite active in politics. Much interesting material dealing with such matters as publishers' contracts and announcements of publication, concert programs, personal letters, accounts, etc., has been included. It is attractive in appearance and is interesting reading. R. G. McC.

College fraternities have so long been a typical feature of the American educational process that the centenary of one of these is fittingly commemorated by a formal history entitled *Delta Upsilon: One Hundred Years, 1834–1934* (published by the Fraternity, pp. xi, 378). The author, Professor W. F. Galpin, remarks in his preface, that the projectors of the work were determined to "have a history and not a song of praise". His material has been drawn from the scattered archives of the chapters as well as of the fraternity headquarters.

The volume entitled *Government-Operated Enterprises in the Panama Canal Zone* (University of Chicago Press, pp. xi, 248, $2.50), by Associate Professor Marshall E. Dimock, is the result of a survey undertaken at the invitation of the Secretary of War with the hope not only that the facts would be enlightening to the public but that such a comprehensive study "might be helpful to some of the newer Government-owned corporations which are just being launched".

The *Historical Magazine* of the Protestant Episcopal Church for September is devoted to the sesquicentennial of the election and consecration of Bishop Samuel Seabury.

The new and enlarged edition of vol. I of Professor A. E. Martin's *History of the United States* (Ginn, pp. xiii, 937) adds to the treatment in the edition of 1928 chapters on the period of discovery and colonization.

The "New Deal" already has its historians, although it cannot yet be said to have passed into history. Louis M. Hacker's *Short History of the New Deal* (Crofts, pp. 151, $1.75) may be regarded as a continuation of his *United States since 1865* (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 385). A treatment more in the nature of an analysis will be found in *Administocracy: the Recovery Laws and their Enforcement* (Macmillan, pp. xi, 118, 50 cents).

In the work entitled *The Two Americas: an Interpretation* (Scribner's, pp. xx, 277, $1.75) Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education, contrasts the civilizations of Latin America and

the United States, and sets forth the main problems in the contemporary relationships of the two Americas. Although the volume contains few facts that are unfamiliar to the expert, and no citations or bibliography, it will nevertheless prove useful. Evidently based upon careful examination of the best secondary works as well as upon personal observations in Latin America, read and criticized before publication by several scholars in the United States, it is remarkably free from errors of fact or interpretation. The intelligent general reader, the college student, and even the expert in the field will not fail to find its pages suggestive and stimulating. J. F. R.

Professor Austin F. Macdonald's textbook on *American State Government and Administration* (Crowell, pp. xiii, 839, $3.75) will be examined with much interest by the general reader, as well as the student, because the rapid development of Federal functions under the "New Deal" leads the onlooker to wonder if the states are to be reduced to the rôle of administrative units or centers of the receipt and distribution of bounty. Although Professor Macdonald has endeavored to bring his facts "up to the minute" he devotes attention only incidentally to Federal-state relations.

Articles: Randolph C. Downes, *Dunmore's War: an Interpretation* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); Ludovic de Contenson, *Les combattants français de la guerre d'Amérique: La Société des Cincinnati* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., July); D. Bonner Smith, *The Capture of the Washington* [Dec. 5, 1775] (Mariner's Mirror, Oct.); Charles M. Wiltse, *Jeffersonian Democracy: a Dual Tradition* (Am. Pol. Sci. Rev., Oct.); John T. Gillard, *Lafayette, Friend of the Negro* (Jour. Negro Hist., Oct.); Thomas D. Clark, *The Slave Trade between Kentucky and the Cotton Kingdom* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); Brainerd Dyer, *Confederate Naval and Privateering Activities in the Pacific* (Pac. Hist. Rev., Dec.); Winston Folk, *The Confederate Naval Academy* (U. S. Naval Inst. Proc., Sept.).

Documents: Philip Dillon Jordan, ed., *Letters of Eliab Parker Mackintire, of Boston, 1845–1863* [III, IV, V] (Bull. New York Public Library, Sept., Oct., Nov.); John D. Barnhart, ed., *Reconstruction on the Lower Mississippi* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.).

NEW ENGLAND, MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The Essex Institute has recently issued vol. III of the *Town Records of Salem, Massachusetts, 1680–1691* (pp. 288, $6.00), and *Early Coastwise and Foreign Shipping of Salem: a Record of the Entrances and Clearances of the Port of Salem, 1750–1760* (pp. 217, $5.00).

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society for April, 1933, just published, contain an article by Professor W. H. Siebert on "General Washington and the Loyalists"; a thoroughgoing account of the "Narragansett

Planters" by W. D. Miller; and an entertaining article on the "Early Circus in America" by the society's librarian, R. W. G. Vail.

The New York State Historical Association held its thirty-fifth annual meeting at Lake Chautauqua, August 22–25, in connection with the Sixtieth Anniversary session of Chautauqua Institution. A conference of local historians presided over by Peter Nelson of the state division of archives and history preceded the formal opening at which Arthur E. Bestor, president of Chautauqua Institution, welcomed the association and turned the meeting over to its president, Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox. The papers read during the four days were about equally divided between those devoted to local history and those of more general interest. On the final day a committee of the local historical societies conducted a well-planned tour of the county which after visiting Harris Community, spiritualistic Lily Dale, and other historic spots, ended with a luncheon at Jamestown where several papers were read including those of State Historian Alexander C. Flick and Charles Messer Stowe, antiques editor of the New York *Sun*. The final session concluded with Dr. Fox's presidential address, "The Protestant Counter-Reformation in America". Special features of the convention included a performance of historical marionettes of the Niagara frontier staged by TERA workers; the unveiling of two portraits destined for Headquarters House at Ticonderoga, one of President Roosevelt, his gift to the collection of New York governors; the other of Dr. Fox, presented by members of the association. E. P. A.

Vol. II of the *Proceedings* of the Union County (New Jersey) Historical Society, which has recently appeared, covers the years 1923–1934. The book may be obtained from the registrar, Mrs. Roland F. Calhoun, 115 Catherine St., Elizabeth. The price is $2.50.

According to the 1933 *Year Book* of the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies there are seventy-one organizations of this type and purpose in the Keystone state.

Among recent acquisitions of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania perhaps the most important single document is the diary of Deborah Norris Logan (1761–1839), wife of Senator George Logan, and a notable figure in the literary history of Pennsylvania. The diary originally contained seventeen large octavo volumes and covered the years 1815–1839, but vols. III and IV (1818–1819) are missing. Historians are indebted to Deborah Norris Logan for her assiduous labors in sorting and bringing to light the rich Logan papers at "Stenton", the famous family seat. One of the volumes mentioned in her diary, James Logan's letter book for 1731–1742, and a letter book of Jonathan Dickinson for 1697–1701 were acquired with the diary, together with letters of Mary Norris, 1786–1799. Among other recent acquisitions are: William Tilghman's letter book (1785–1827) and ledger (1813–1827);

9 letters of Peter S. Du Ponceau, 1842–1844; an interesting Revolutionary document of camp life, Ebenezer Elmer's journal, 1779–1781, containing a mixture of camp humor, poetry, songs, facetious general orders, and medical notes; a minute book concerning the settlement of affairs of the Schuylkill Bank, 1840–1843; Charles Thomson's farm diary, 1792–1793, and letter to Governor Weare, January 16, 1784; an indenture signed by Philadelphia entrepreneurs for operating a New Jersey lead mine, 1724; Edwin Greble Papers, 175 letters, maps, and miscellaneous documents relating to the Civil War, Philadelphia society, and travels; a deed and a power of attorney signed by William Penn, 1684 and 1702; 628 World War posters. J. P. B.

The early pages of the volume entitled *The Philadelphia Club* (Philadelphia, privately printed, pp. 177) enlarge the "Sketch" written by Mr. A. J. Dallas Dixon, which was the first history of this, the oldest club of its kind in the United States of America. It preceded the Union Club of New York by two years—when Philadelphia had 82,000 inhabitants. Edward Everett, John Slidell, and Henry Clay were guests of the club, and many distinguished foreign guests including the Prince of Wales [Edward VII] discreetly veiled as "Mr. Tudor". During the Civil War feeling in the club ran extremely high. It is said that at one time different dining rooms were provided for the Northern and Southern sympathizers. C. H. C.

Articles: Kenneth W. Porter, *Samuel Gorton* (New Eng. Quar., Sept.); Josephine J. Mayer, *Major Robert Rogers, Trader* (New York Hist., Oct.); W. W. Parker, *The Migration from Vermont to Northern New York* (*ibid.*); W. R. Richardson and W. H. Richardson, *Old Jersey and New Jersey* (Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc., Oct.); *John Hunt's Diary* [1777–1780] [cont'd] (*ibid.*); James E. Gibson, *The Pennsylvania Provincial Conference of 1776* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Oct.); Lloyd A. M. Corkan, *The Beaver and Lake Erie Canal* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Sept.); John A. Adams, *The Indian Trader of the Upper Ohio Valley* (*ibid.*).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The first volume of the *Virginia Historical Index,* prepared by Dr. E. G. Swem, librarian of the College of William and Mary, has appeared. This monumental work, making readily accessible for the study of the Old Dominion the resources of notable Virginia historical magazines, the *Calendar of Virginia State Papers,* and *Hening's Statutes of Virginia,* will shortly be reviewed in this journal.

The *Fourth Annual Report* of Dr. Lester J. Cappon, archivist, University of Virginia Library, discusses the progress made during the year 1933–1934 in the survey and collection of Virginia historical materials and points out the relation of this research to the growing national movement along these

lines. Only three new counties were surveyed (Brunswick, Halifax, and Russell), because the attention of the archivist was concentrated mainly upon newspapers. He is preparing for publication in 1935 a Bibliography of Virginia newspapers since 1820 which will include the holdings of leading libraries in the United States and of all libraries and editors' offices in Virginia. Among the manuscripts obtained for the library the following families are represented: Ambler, Gilmer, Graham, Leftwich, Sydnor, Wallace, and Cocke, the papers of the last-named "loaned for certain special investigations now in progress". Of special interest to the economic historian are general store and tradesmen's account books (19th century) and the correspondence and accounts of James S. Easley of Halifax C. H. concerning his investments in public lands in Iowa, Wisconsin, and neighboring territory, 1854–*ca.* 1900. A Leica camera for copying, MSS., etc., has been acquired by the University Library. A list of "Parish Records of the Diocese of Virginia, 1653–1900", with an index, is printed as an appendix to the archivist's report.

In *Crime and the Virginia Gazette, 1736–1775,* Marion Dargan, associate professor of history and political science (University of New Mexico Bulletin, Sociological series, vol. II, no. 1), aims to show that crimes and lurid tales of crime were relatively as frequent in the "good, old times" as they are to-day.

Clarence Griffin, county historian of Rutherford County, North Carolina, who has been doing much to bring to light the history of his county, has brought out *Public Officials of Rutherford County, North Carolina, 1779–1934,* "with introductory sketches of origin and development of various county offices, and public and local laws governing the same" (Forest City Courier, Forest City, North Carolina, pp. 41).

Continuing as the fourth volume of Frederick C. Chabot's Early Texas Series of historical documents, *The Perote Prisoners, being the Diary of James L. Trueheart* (San Antonio, Naylor Company, pp. xiv, 344, $5.00) offers a personal account of the experiences of the Texans captured by General Adrian Woll's Mexican army in San Antonio, September 11, 1842. The volume contains a number of documents besides the Trueheart journal, which was itself rather irregularly kept, and which the editor has supplemented by copious footnote excerpts from the diaries of Samuel A. Maverick and others, as well as from Thomas J. Green's *Journal of the Texian Expedition against Mier,* and William P. Stapp's *Prisoners of Perote.* The Trueheart Diary gives a fairly graphic picture of the capture of San Antonio and the march of the captives to Mexico City and Castle Perote, together with some description of Trueheart's confinement at the last-named place. Chabot's "Historical Introduction", pp. 7–87, occupies nearly one-fourth of the volume, and is a rambling, discursive, and gossipy treatment of early San Antonio history, much of it quoted bodily from early historians, and

much of it also irrelevant. The footnotes are packed with excerpts, many of them interesting, from other accounts and such "authorities" as Terry's *Guide to Mexico*. The proofreading was poorly done and the entire volume abounds with typographical errors and provincialisms, but there is a serviceable index. R. K. W.

Articles: Bert J. Loewenberg, *Efforts of the South to encourage Immigration, 1865–1900* (South Atlantic Quar., Oct.); Henry J. Berkley, *The Proprietary Manors and Hundreds of St. Mary's, Old Charles, Calvert, New Charles, and Prince George's Counties* (Maryland Hist. Mag., Sept.); George C. Keidel, *Early Maryland Newspapers* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); G. MacLaren Brydon, *The Huguenots of Manakin Town* (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., Oct.); Lyon G. Tyler, *The Original Counties* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); J. E. Davis Yonge, *Henry A. Wise and the Presidency* (Florida Hist. Soc. Quar., Oct.); William H. Gehrke, *The Beginnings of the Pennsylvania German Element in Rowan and Cabarrus Counties, North Carolina* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Oct.); Lawrence F. London, *The Representation Controversy in Colonial North Carolina* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Oct.); William A. Russ, jr., *Radical Disfranchisement in North Carolina, 1867–1868* (*ibid.*); Sanford Winston, *Indian Slavery in the Carolina Region* (Jour. Negro Hist., Oct.); A. B. Bender, *The Texas Frontier* [II] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Oct.); Edwin J. Foscue, *Agriculture on the Lower Rio Grande* (Agricultural Hist., July).

Documents: Robert A. Stewart, ed., *Excerpts from the Charles City County Records, 1665–1666* (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., Oct.); C. A. Hoppin, ed., *The Principio Iron Works* [letters of William Chetwynd to John England, Oct. 5, 1725–Aug. 19, 1726] (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Oct.); A. R. Newsome, ed., *John Brown's Journal of Travel in Western North Carolina in 1795* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Oct.); *The Panton-Leslie Papers: John Leslie to John Forbes, September 21, 1803* (Florida Hist. Soc. Quar., Oct.).

WESTERN TERRITORIES AND STATES

In commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Daniel Boone the Boone Bicentennial Commission of Lexington has sponsored a facsimile edition of the original Wilmington edition of John Filson's *Kentucke and the Adventures of Col. Daniel Boone* (Louisville, John P. Morton Company, $1.60). It is edited by Willard Rouse Jillson, D. Sc. The frontispiece is a reduced facsimile of Filson's first map of "Kentucke".

In the November number of *Museum Echoes* Dr. W. D. Overman, curator of history, Ohio State Archæological and Historical Society, lists the research projects in Ohio history now in progress.

The *Indiana History Bulletin* for May is a Memorial of the late John E.

Iglehart, founder and former president of the Southwestern Indiana Historical Society. It includes besides the recent proceedings of that society a paper on "Standards and Subjects of Historical Society Work", which illustrates the Westward Movement from the history of Southwestern Indiana.

The Indiana Historical Society has recently petitioned the state highway commission to adopt as a program for the immediate future "roadside planting along the whole length of the historic highways of the state, beginning with the National Road (U. S. 40) and the Michigan Road" from Madison to Michigan City. Indiana is fortunate if there are not certain things along its highways which must be uprooted before the planting takes place.

The restoration of New Salem, Illinois, has now proceeded to an advanced stage, though the work is still incomplete. In this type of enterprise the historian joins with the architect, the archæologist, the contractor, the furniture expert, and even the chemist, who treats the logs against weathering. The actual process of restoration is reviewed in a pamphlet entitled *Record of the Restoration of New Salem,* by J. F. Booton, issued by the Department of Public Works of the State of Illinois; while the delightful new volume under the title *Lincoln's New Salem* (Springfield, Abraham Lincoln Association, pp. 128), by Benjamin P. Thomas, gives a fresh, authentic, and sympathetic story of that part of Lincoln's life which was associated with this tiny frontier town on the Sangamon. These books remind us that early Illinois cabins were solidly and skillfully built; that they were "neat and tidy"; that the furniture was of a sort that thrills the present-day antique fancier; and that a cabin in its setting is the delight of the artist. Mr. Thomas, in summarizing the place of New Salem in Lincoln's life, writes of the lasting impress of this rural background, the "twang of the crossroads" in Lincoln's anecdotes, and the transformation of a piece of frontier driftwood to a man well equipped, in self-education and friendship, for life's tasks. J. G. R.

The August and September numbers of the series Glimpses of the Past, published by the Missouri Historical Society, are "North Carolinians' Comments on Missouri", taken from the Greensboro *Patriot,* and "Life in Colonial St. Louis: the French Mother and Housewife".

The University of Oklahoma Press has added to its series entitled The Civilization of the American Indian John H. Seger's *Early Days among the Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indians* (pp. 155, $2.00). The editor, Stanley Vestal, originally published this account in the *Bulletin* of the university ten years ago. He has now added an appendix giving the "Tradition of the Cheyenne Indians", the account of their early history "handed down by word of mouth from generation to generation", and imparted to Seger by the Indian appointed to keep the tradition. It is a document of great interest.

Articles: Samuel M. Wilson, *Daniel Boone, 1734–1934* (Filson Club Hist.

Quar., Oct.); Lucile S. Williams, *John Cabell Breckinridge* (Register Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Oct.); Wilfrid Hibbert, *The Recently Discovered Pictorial Map of Fort Meigs and Environs* (Hist. Soc. of Northwestern Ohio Quar. Bull., Oct.); Clayton S. Ellsworth, *Ohio's Legislative Attack upon Abolition Schools* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); Blaine Brooks Gernon, *Chicago and Abraham Lincoln* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Oct.); Ruby J. Swartzlow, *Early History of Lead Mining in Missouri* [concl.] (Missouri Hist. Rev., Oct.); William J. Petersen, *Population Advance to the Upper Mississippi Valley, 1830–1860* (Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol., Oct.); William R. Riddell, *Indian Episodes of Early Michigan* (Michigan Hist. Mag., summer and autumn); Everett E. Edwards, *American Indian Contributions to Civilization* (Minnesota Hist., Sept.); *Sister* M. Aquinas Norton, *Missionary Activity in the Northwest under the French Régime, 1640–1740* (Acta et Dicta, Oct.); Humphrey Moynihan, *Archbishop Ireland's Colonies* (*ibid.*); T. H. Scheffer, *Geographical Names in Ottawa County* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Aug.); George A. Root, *Ferries in Kansas, IV: Republican River* (*ibid.*); LeRoy R. Hafen, *The Edward B. Morgan Collection* [Western Americana] (Colorado Mag., Nov.); Leon W. Fuller, *Colorado's Revolt against Capitalism* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); Arthur H. Hall, *The Red Stick War: Creek Indian Affairs during the War of 1812* (Chron. Oklahoma, Sept.); A. B. Bender, *Frontier Defense in the Territory of New Mexico, 1853–1861* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., Oct.); Oscar Osburn Winther, *Stage-Coach Service in Northern California, 1849–1852* (Pac. Hist. Rev., Dec.); Lalla R. Boone, *Vancouver on the Northwest Coast* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Sept.); J. B. Munro, *Mormon Colonization Scheme for Van Couver Island* (Washington Hist. Quar., Oct.); Theodore S. Farelly, *The Russians and Pre-Bering Alaska* (Pac. Hist. Rev., Dec.); Ralph S. Kuykendall, *Early Hawaiian Commercial Development* (*ibid.*).

Documents: Lewis J. Carey, ed., *Franklin is informed of Clark's Activities in the Old Northwest* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Dec.); Elva Tooker, ed., *A Kentucky Merchant's Problems in the Early Nineteenth Century* (Bull. Business Hist. Soc., Oct.); M. M. Quaife and Florence Emmery, eds., *Lemuel Shattuck and the University of Michigania* (Michigan Hist. Mag., summer and autumn); Celestine N. Bittle, O. M. Cap., ed., *Five Years in America: Journal of a Missionary among the Redskins* [Father Anthony Maria Gachet, O. M. Cap.] (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., Sept.); *A New Englander in the West: Letters of Eben Weld, 1845–1850* (Minnesota Hist., Sept.); *A Tour of Indian Agencies in Kansas and the Indian Territory in 1870* [excerpts from the diary of Dr. William Nicholson] (Kansas Hist. Quar., Aug.).

CANADA

General review: Eduard Ziehen, *Canadianism: Zur Genesis der kanadischen Nation* (Hist. Zeitsch., Aug.).

Two articles of considerable interest to historians in vol. VII (1934) *Contributions to Canadian Economics* (University of Toronto Press, pp. 186) are "English Land Tenure of the North American Continent: a Summary", by Norman Macdonald, and "Construction of Railways in Canada [a list, pt. 2], from 1885 to 1931", by M. L. Bladen.

The *Twenty-second Report* (for 1933) of the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario, edited by Alexander Fraser, deputy minister, is made up of the Minutes of General Quarter Sessions of the Peace for the London District, April 1, 1800, to September 12, 1809, and December 4, 1813, to December 26, 1818.

Articles: Gustave Lanctot, *The Elective Council of Quebec of 1657* (Canadian Hist. Rev., June); L. J. Burkholder, *The Early Mennonite Settlements in Ontario* (Mennonite Quar. Rev., July); Augustus N. Hand, *Local Incidents of the Papineau Rebellion* (New York History, Oct.); William D. Overman, *I. D. Andrews and Reciprocity in 1854: an Episode in Dollar Diplomacy* (Can. Hist. Rev., Sept.); C. P. Stacey, *A Fenian Interlude: the Story of Michael Murphy* (*ibid.*, June); Donald C. Masters, *A. T. Galt and Canadian Fiscal Autonomy* (*ibid.*, Sept.); W. B. Kerr, *Supplementary List of Historical Literature relating to Canada's Part in the Great War* (ibid., June).

Documents: J. Bartlet Brebner, ed., *Nova Scotia's Remedy for the American Revolution* (Canadian Hist. Rev., June).

CUBA, MEXICO, AND SOUTH AMERICA

South American Progress (Harvard University Press, pp. vi, 240, $2.50), by C. H. Haring, professor of Latin-American history and economics in Harvard University, consists of lectures given before the Lowell Institute in Boston. Although, as the author remarks in his preface, "in no sense a contribution to knowledge", its excellent style, judicious emphasis, and accuracy make it a good reference work for undergraduates in college courses, and the layman will also profit by scanning its pages. It contains sketches of the internal history of the A B C States, an excellent brief discussion of international difficulties in the La Plata area and among the Pacific Coast countries, a good survey of the political history of Colombia, and scattered paragraphs on the historical development of all the other independent states of South America save Venezuela; but footnotes are lacking, as well as an index and a bibliography. J. F. R.

Mrs. Nellie V. Sánchez has prepared a volume entitled *Stories of the Latin American States* which contains a goodly store of information about those states as well as about European possessions in the New World presented in a fashion suitable to young people.

Former Ambassador H. F. Guggenheim pays special attention to the years since 1898 in a volume entitled *The United States and Cuba: a Study of International Relations* (Macmillan).

An English translation of José Luis Blasio's *Maximilian íntimo: El Emperador Maximilian y su corte* has been made by R. H. Murray, with a foreword by Carleton Beals (Yale University Press).

Luis Martínez Delgado has published the first volume of *Revistas políticas publicadas en el Repertorio Colombiana* (Bogotá, Imprenta Nacional).

Articles: Peter M. Dunne, *The Literature of the Jesuits of New Spain* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Oct.); Arias Argáez, *Don José Cortés de Madariaga* (Bol. Hist. y Antig., no. 244); Nicolás García Samudio, *El viaje de Humboldt á América* (*ibid.*, no. 245); W. C. Atkinson, *America in Spain* (Hispania, Oct.); Daniel Figueroa, *et al., Congreso Eucarístico internacional* (Estudios, July); J. Jijón y Caamaño, *Los orígines de Cuzco* (An. Uni. Cent., Apr.); Charles C. Hyde, *Looking towards the Arbitration of the Dispute over the Chaco Boreal* (Am. Jour. Int. Law, Oct.); Lester H. Wolsey, *The Chaco Dispute* (*ibid.*); *Viriato* Díaz Pérez, *La revolución comunera del Paraguay* (Rev. Españas, Apr., May, June); Manuel Ugarte, *El crepúsculo del imperialismo yanki* (*ibid.*, July); Andrés F. Ponte, *La anteiglesia de Zenarruza* (Bol. Ac. Nac. Hist., July); Henri van Deursen, *L'émancipation industrielle du Brésil* (Rev. Éc. Int., Aug.); Harold F. Peterson, *Mariano Moreno: the Making of an Insurgent* (Hispan. Am. Hist. Rev., Nov.); Frederic William Ganzert, *The Boundary Controversy in the Upper Amazon between Brazil, Bolivia, and Peru, 1903–1909* (*ibid.*).

W. S. R.

The following persons have made contributions to the section of Historical News: E. P. Alexander, J. P. Boyd, Jean Brookes, P. C. Brooks, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, L. J. Cappon, C. H. Chandler, M. E. Curti, E. N. Curtis, Elizabeth Donnan, K. R. Greenfield, J. F. Jameson, W. T. Laprade, L. M. Larson, H. F. MacNair, R. G. McCutchan, A. J. May, J. G. Randall, J. F. Rippy, W. S. Robertson, J. M. Vincent, R. K. Wyllys.